

EQUITY AND LAW

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—Cecil Henry Russell, Esq. *Deputy-Chairman*—John Croft Deverell, Esq.
 Harold Agnew, Esq. Archibald Herbert James, Esq.
 C. E. Broughton, Esq. The Rt. Hon. Lord Macnaghten, G.C.M.G.
 Edmund Church, Esq. William Maples, Esq.
 Philip G. Collins, Esq. Edward Moberly, Esq.
 Sir Kenelm E. Digby, G.C.B., K.C. The Hon. Mr. Justice Phillimore.
 Charles Baker Dimond, Esq. George Thompson Powell, Esq.
 Sir Howard W. Elphinstone, Bart. Mark Lemon Romer, Esq., K.C.
 The Hon. Mr. Justice Grantham. The Hon. Charles Russell.
 Richard L. Harrison, Esq. Richard Stephens Taylor, Esq.
 L. W. North Hickley, Esq. H. P. Bowling Trevanion, Esq.

FUNDS EXCEED - - £4,594,000.

All classes of Life Assurance Granted. Reversions and Life Interests Purchased.
 Loans on Approved Securities entertained on Favourable Terms.

W. P. PHELPS, *Actuary and Secretary.*

THE BRITISH LAW FIRE

INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED,

5, LOTHBURY, LONDON, E.C.

(with Branches throughout the Kingdom).

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL AND RESERVES - - £1,280,000
FIRE, LOSS OF PROFITS DUE TO FIRE, EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY under Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, and independently thereof, ACCIDENT AND SICKNESS, and BURGLARY.

Gentlemen in a position to introduce Business are invited to undertake Agencies within the United Kingdom.

No Foreign Business undertaken.

Manager and Secretary—H. FOSTER CUTLER.

FLOWERDEW & CO.,

COSTS DRAWN AND SETTLED (from papers alone, if necessary),

TRANSLATIONS OF NOTARIAL QUALITY.

VERBATIM LAW REPORTING.

Permanent Office Staff in each Department.

Head Offices: 14, BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAR, W.C.

Also at 11, Poultry and Salisbury House, E.C.

Telephones: Holborn 900 and Central 6150. Telegrams: "Flowerdew, London."

LEGAL AND GENERAL

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS	£8,931,000
INCOME	£965,000
YEARLY BUSINESS	£3,865,000
BUSINESS IN FORCE	£25,715,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance

is peculiar to this Society and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WHOLE LIFE.—WITHOUT PROFITS.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 %.	30	£1 16 %.	40	£2 10 %.

Rate of Bonus at last three Valuations, **£1 18s. %** per annum.

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c. :—Om. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,438	£1,724	£2,067

Full information on application to

THE MANAGER, 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, MARCH 12, 1910.

•• The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	335	COMPANIES	344
GIFTS FROM HUSBAND TO WIFE	338	OBITUARY	345
REVIEWS	339	LEGAL NEWS	345
CORRESPONDENCE	340	COURT PAPERS	345
POINTS TO BE NOTED	341	WINDING-UP NOTICES	349
SOCIETIES	344	CREDITORS' NOTICES	349
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	344	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	351

PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES.

Cases Reported this Week.

Bullus v. Bullus	343
Hucklesby and Atkinson's Contract, Re	342
Pullen (Deceased), Re, Parker v. Pullen	341
Seed, Re, Ex parte King	343
Smith's Advertising Agency v. Leeds Laboratory Co.	341
Tilley v. Bowman (Lim.)	342

Current Topics.

The New Judges' Bill.

THE BILL for enabling the appointment of two additional judges of the King's Bench Division was introduced by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords on Wednesday, and it appears to be intended to be passed through all its stages in that House early next week. The Bill, although stated to be extremely short, was not issued up to our going to press.

The Recent Legal Changes.

THE LEGAL WORLD has been somewhat startled during the past week by the announcement of a series of changes in important legal posts, apparently carried out so suddenly that no arrangements were able to be made for carrying on the ordinary business of the court affected. The result has been to throw a certain air of mystery over the whole transaction, and to goad imagination into a somewhat futile activity. Sir JOHN BIGHAM has resigned the Presidency of the Divorce, Probate, and Admiralty Division, and has been made a peer, being succeeded in the judicial capacity by Sir SAMUEL EVANS, the Solicitor-General, while Mr. RUFUS ISAACS, K.C., has been promoted to the office of Solicitor-General in his place. Sir JOHN BIGHAM is understood to have been long ambitious of a peerage, an ambition which is now satisfied, and which possibly lies at the root of the sudden *dénoûment*, for his promotion about a year ago to the Presidency of the Divorce Court is better explained as a step in his triumphal progress to the peerage than in any other way. A vigorous, pushing, and capable commercial lawyer and politician, but lacking in all the more delicate qualities of dignity, temper, and taste, his selection for that particular post was received with some surprise; which was certainly not diminished by the report of a speech at Liverpool made by him at a reception in honour of his appointment, nor by his subsequent utterances on the bench. But his meteor-like career in that branch of the judiciary is now ended, and he will doubtless find a more congenial sphere both in the judicial work and the political battles which will engage his attention in the House of Lords. The former will afford ample scope for his acquired experience in commercial law, while the latter will provide a wide field for his natural pugnacity of disposition.

The New President of the Divorce, &c., Division.

THE PROMOTION of Sir SAMUEL EVANS to the Presidency of the Divorce, Probate and Admiralty Division is interesting as the

first occasion on which a barrister has been appointed to that office directly from the bar since the qualification for the post was defined by the Judicature Act of 1891. The example may possibly be turned into a precedent for the promotion of Solicitors-General who do not attain to the rank of Attorney-General; but we should deprecate any precedent for the necessary promotion of law officers to any particular post. Every vacancy should be considered on its merits. On the present occasion the late Solicitor-General will succeed to the post with the goodwill of all. He comes to it with a reputation rather the reverse of his immediate predecessor—namely, as a man of admitted temper, tact, and dignity, but without profound knowledge of any special branch of law. Happily the law administered in this particular division is generally of a simple character and easily acquired. And Sir SAMUEL EVANS has throughout his career shewn an easy adaptability and adequate success in all work which has fallen to his lot, as well as a faculty for making himself popular with his opponents. He should have no difficult task now in ingratiating himself with the litigants and professional men appearing before him, which might not have been so easy if he had immediately succeeded Lord GORELL.

The New Solicitor-General.

It is hardly necessary to speak of Mr. RUFUS ISAACS, the new Solicitor-General, who should be as valuable an addition to the Government as he will be a loss to his private clients. Thoroughly versed in human affairs, not only by the versatility of his temperament, but by the variety of his occupations as seaman, stockbroker and lawyer, he has distinguished himself also by his remarkable grit under adverse circumstances, and has developed all the faculties of a great advocate, excepting a sense of humour but including a high sense of honour. With Sir EDWARD CLARKE and Sir EDWARD CARSON he shares the reputation of being in the foremost rank of the bar and a pet of the public in all *causes célèbres*; and he now joins them in another capacity by his elevation to the post of Solicitor-General. He should be a great acquisition to the Government in advocacy, law and finance, and we cannot wish him better fortune than that he may walk in the footsteps of the only former Jewish Law Officer, Sir GEORGE JESSEL.

Lord Halsbury in the Court of Appeal.

It WAS a happy thought to ask Lord HALSBURY to avail himself of his own Act—the Judicature Act, 1891, a sort of five-minutes' Bill, which originally appeared without heading or marginal notes—and to come to the relief of Court of Appeal No. 1, when deprived of its President, off to battle with the Welshmen. The popular fancy has been immensely struck with the spectacle of a man in his eighty-fifth year taking charge of a court of particularly clever judges with the same efficiency and authority as if he had just reached middle age. What, people ask, is the secret of this intellectual longevity? Well, we imagine it is largely freedom from worry. Lord HALSBURY has always apprehended things with half the effort of most people; he has always had a powerful and retentive memory, and he has availed himself of these aids to the fullest extent, and so as to get through his work with an ease and freedom from fatigue which has rendered him the envy of his contemporaries. For him "no toil o'er books consumed the midnight oil." There are probably now—there were certainly formerly—sundry old solicitors who could tell you that when he was at the bar he would stroll into consultation, pick up the points of the case from his junior while on the way to Westminster, pick up more from his opponent's address, and finally fight the case as well (as it was expressed to us) as if he had spent a week over the papers. His mental machine was never overstrained, and appears to this day to be as efficient as ever.

The Divorce Commission.

THE EVIDENCE before the Divorce Commission shews that the Commission will have before them very conflicting views as to the wisdom of extending jurisdiction in divorce to provincial tribunals. The case for this extension, and for the selection of the county court as the appropriate tribunal, was strongly put by Mr.

C. H. PICKSTONE, the registrar of the Bury County Court. A primary consideration is that of cost. Mr. PICKSTONE considers that the cost of undefended divorce cases in London—some £30 to £35—could be reduced to £10 in the county court; and that generally in divorce causes a trial in the county court would mean a reduction of nearly two-thirds in the expenses. And he favours the county court rather than the assizes, because the courts are more numerous than the assize towns, and are held more frequently than the assizes. Moreover, he attaches importance to having a judge who is acquainted with the local circumstances. And jurisdiction to make separation orders should, in Mr. PICKSTONE'S opinion, be either taken away from the justices and given to the county court, or should be limited. At the same time, the suggested county court jurisdiction should be the means of diminishing the difference between rich and poor in regard to divorce, not of increasing the facilities for divorce. Hence it should be limited to persons whose income does not exceed £3 a week, a restriction also advocated by Mr. H. GOUGH, the registrar of the Southend County Court. Incidentally Mr. PICKSTONE recommended the abolition of actions for breach of promise, and he agreed with the views of several other witnesses in favour of placing the sexes on an equality, and extending the grounds of divorce to include permanent lunacy, habitual drunkenness, and long imprisonment. Evidence was also given by Mr. F. W. DENDY, the registrar of the Newcastle-on-Tyne County Court, in favour of giving limited jurisdiction in divorce to selected county courts, and he estimated the county court costs as likely to be only one-third of the costs at assizes; but separation orders he would reserve for the police courts. Mr. H. GOUGH, who is both registrar of the county court and clerk to the magistrates at Edmonton, differed on this last point, and advised the transfer of the separation orders to the county courts, where they would be incidental to the divorce business. The commission are likely to be considerably assisted by this evidence from county court officials.

Trial by Jury in Divorce Cases.

MR. W. T. BARNARD, K.C., in his evidence before the Royal Commission on the Divorce Laws, gave as one of his reasons for objecting to the trial of divorce cases by the county courts, that county court juries were not suitable for the trial of persons on quasi-criminal charges, because such juries would be drawn from the district in which the alleged offences had taken place. They would have heard a good deal of talk on the subject, and consequently in many cases they would have made up their minds before they went into the box. These objections will no doubt receive the fullest consideration, but they form a singular comment on the fact that juries in the early history of trial by jury were themselves the witnesses by whose evidence the prisoner's fate was decided. The steps by which the jury ceased to be witnesses, and became judges of the evidence given by others, cannot easily be traced, but trial by jury in criminal cases is still essentially a local inquiry, and it is considered a serious hardship if the criminal is tried at a considerable distance from his place of residence. Mr. BARNARD went on to say that he was in favour of trial by jury in divorce cases, on the ground that when there was a great conflict of evidence, it was better to have the verdict of twelve men instead of that of a single judge. But in answer to a question from the chairman as to whether it is not generally the view that a jury is desirable in bad, and a judge in good, cases, Mr. BARNARD replied without hesitation "That is so." His evidence may be contrasted with that of Sir J. BIGHAM, who does not appear to have much faith in the benefit to be derived from a number of judges, and assuming that the verdicts of juries are just in the majority of instances, it may well be believed that the exceptions are more numerous than in the case of trials by judges without juries.

Increase in the Price of Malt Liquors Supplied to a Tied House.

THE ARGUMENT of the defendant in the case of *Courage & Co. (Limited) v. Carpenter* (1910, 1 Ch. 262) was surrounded with difficulties. He was assignee of a brewer's lease of a Metropolitan

public-house, the lessee covenanting for himself and his assigns that he would not during the term buy any malt liquors other than such as should have been purchased by him of the owners or their successors in business. In the month of June last the principal brewers and brewery companies trading in London, in consequence of the increased licence duties proposed by the Budget, agreed with one another that the price of all malt liquors sold within the Metropolitan police area by them should be raised 6s. a barrel, and that no malt liquors should be sold by any of them at a lower price. They accordingly gave notice to the defendant that on and after the 1st of July their prices would be increased by 6s. a barrel. The defendant refused to pay the increased prices, and in an action by the owners to restrain him from buying malt liquors other than such as should have been purchased from the owners, he contended that the plaintiffs were endeavouring to cast upon him the burden of completely bearing the extra licence duties proposed to be imposed by the Finance Bill, 1909; that the increased prices were unfair and oppressive, and that by charging them the plaintiffs made an unreasonable profit. The judgment of NEVILLE, J., explains clearly why, in his opinion, this contention was wholly unfounded. The learned judge, with reference to the proposition that the owners were not entitled to shift the burden upon the shoulders of the public which was intended by the Government to be borne by themselves, observes that there is nothing in the law of this country, as he understands it, which makes it improper for a man to shift the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of others if he can do so without infringing the law. With regard to the reasonableness of the increase in the price, he was unable to see upon the evidence that the result of this operation would be to materially increase the profits of the brewers. They contemplated a reduction in their trade, and it would be difficult for anyone to say how far it would have shrunk had the increased prices been maintained. At present those prices had been reduced, and the court had only to deal with what took place in the past. The learned judge was, in fact, asked to hold that the prices adopted practically by the whole of the London brewers, and assented to by practically the whole of the licensed victuallers trading in London, were unreasonable prices.

Commercial Law of the Empire—Bills of Exchange.

WE NOTICED recently (*ante*, p. 227) one step towards the assimilation, and possibly the eventual unification, of the commercial law of the Empire as having been taken by the "federalization" in Australia of the law of marine insurance. The English Marine Insurance Act, 1906, was substantially taken as it stands and made to apply to the whole of the Australian Commonwealth. The law of bills of exchange has been similarly treated in Australia. By the Bills of Exchange Act, 1909, passed by the Commonwealth Legislature in December last, the law relating to negotiable instruments has been unified for Australia, and the various State Acts on the subject abrogated. In each of the six States—New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania—the English Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, had already been enacted, with slight modifications, and in all except New South Wales the alteration effected by the Bills of Exchange (Crossed Cheques) Act, 1906, had been substantially reproduced. The new Commonwealth Act has, therefore, in following the English Acts of 1882 and 1906, done little more than effect a very convenient piece of statute consolidation, which will for the future render it necessary to consult one Commonwealth Act in lieu of some twenty State Acts of Parliament, in considering the Australian law of negotiable instruments. The differences between the new Australian Act and the two English Acts are very slight. The Act is only to come into force when proclaimed, and, having been assented to on the 13th of December last, the proclamation (if it has not already taken place) is not likely to be long delayed. In the definition of "inland bill," "Australasia" is naturally substituted for "British Islands." Section 65 (corresponding with section 60 of the English Act of 1882) has an added clause referring to orders on demand drawn by one branch of a bank on another branch of the same bank. This was one of the matters dealt with in *Capital and*

Counties Bank v. Gordon (1903, A. C. 240). Section 88 (corresponding with section 82 of the English Act of 1882) has a sub-section reproducing section 2 of the English Act of 1906. There is one point on which the new Australian Act adheres to the English Acts, in preference to reproducing a statutory amendment of the law which was introduced into the statutes of two of the States in order to defeat the effect of the Privy Council's decision in *Colonial Bank v. Marshall* (1906, A. C. 559). This case (which affirmed the decision of the High Court of Australia) has been thought to seriously affect the liability of bankers for alterations made in carelessly drawn cheques, by laying down the rule that the mere fact of a cheque being drawn with spaces that can be utilized for the purpose of fraudulent alteration is not in itself a violation of duty by the customer to his banker. In 1905 the following enactment was passed in Queensland: "Where a bank, in good faith and without negligence, pays a bill or note drawn on or made payable at the bank, and the bill or note has been so drawn, accepted, or made by a customer as to afford facility for any fraudulent alteration in the amount thereof, and the bill or note has been so fraudulently altered, the bank shall not be responsible or incur any liability by reason of having paid the bill or note." In 1906 a similar enactment (but relating to cheques only) was passed in Tasmania, though this Act was expressly declared to be in force only until the end of the year 1907. The new Australian Act appears not to have reproduced this Queensland enactment and expired Tasmanian enactment. In Queensland, accordingly, the decision in *Colonial Bank v. Marshall* will again become law from the moment of the new Commonwealth Act coming into operation, and the new Act must, of course, be read subject to the effect of the decision.

The Appointment of Justices.

THE EVIDENCE given by the Lord Chancellor before the Royal Commission on the Selection of Justices of the Peace last week shewed very clearly the difficulties associated with this matter. In principle, of course, the appointment of justices has nothing to do with politics; in practice, the benches shew a large preponderance of justices of one political party. A great many people, says Lord LOREBURN, put this down to deliberate political partiality. For himself, he does not believe that this is so; though he regards it as contrary to the public interest that the authority of justices should be weakened by any widespread suspicion that the members of it are not fairly selected. As to the class of men who should be appointed he speaks clearly. "Justices of the peace should be men of independence, of integrity, of good repute, and of good sense. It is not a question of social rank." But it is very much a question how to get these men appointed. Lord LOREBURN is strongly opposed to redressing the political inequality of the bench by appointments not made on sound lines. The responsibility for the appointments rests with him, and though he relies in counties on the recommendations of the Lords Lieutenants, yet he does not admit a right in any one to control his judgment. In fact, in the past four years some 5,500 justices have been appointed in the counties, and all but some fifty have been appointed with the concurrence of the Lords Lieutenants. In the boroughs there is no such well-defined course of recommendation. Lord SELBORNE introduced the practice of consulting the town councils, but the Lord Chancellor states that that has been discontinued for twenty-five years. In the absence of any settled source of nominations, the Lord Chancellor has to rely upon such local information as he can obtain, and the task of selecting suitable men seems to be very great. Lord LOREBURN would almost prefer popular election—much as he is opposed to it—to selection under pressure from members of Parliament, and he is strongly opposed to transferring the selection to the members themselves. If any change is made, he apparently prefers the idea of entrusting the selection to a committee of the Privy Council. The duty, he points out, at present belongs to the Lord Chancellor in his character of the head of the judicature, entrusted with the task of deciding what is best for the administration of justice, and, if it remains with him, Lord LOREBURN insists that he must be regarded as performing it in a judicial spirit, and not as an administrative member

of the Government. The work, he thinks, might be facilitated by the appointment of local advisory committees. But however the work is done, it will be agreed that it should be divested of political considerations, though whether, having regard to social conditions, the two parties will ever be evenly represented is another matter.

Liability of Parent for Wilful Damage by Child.

WE ARE much obliged to a correspondent for calling our attention to an oversight in a paragraph under the above heading in our last week's issue. In a case where a girl aged seventeen was charged with wilfully breaking panes of glass in the window of a church, the justices were said to have ordered the girl's father to pay the damages and costs. In commenting upon this decision, we suggested that it might have been given under the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901; but we added that there was a difficulty in the way of this explanation, inasmuch as no default on the part of the parent was shown, and further, that a "young person," as interpreted by section 11 of the Act, means a person who, in the opinion of the court before whom he is brought, is of the age of twelve, and under the age of sixteen, years. Our correspondent points out that the reference should have been to the Children Act, 1908, which contains further and more extensive provisions for making the parent of a young offender responsible for the wrongdoing of his child. The new Act requires the attendance in court of the parent in all cases where the child is charged, unless it is satisfied that it would be unreasonable to require his attendance; and with regard to the question whether he has conduced to the commission of the offence by neglecting to exercise due care of his child, shifts the onus of proof from the prosecution to the parent. The parent has, of course, an opportunity of being heard. The definition of "young person" is amended by section 128 of the Act. As amended, however, it does not apply to persons above the age of sixteen; but our correspondent is probably right in suggesting that in the case referred to the magistrates were of opinion that the girl was under sixteen.

Re-election to Parliament of Persons Appointed to Offices under the Crown.

WE HEAR that a Bill has been brought in by Sir HENRY CRAIK to abolish the necessity for ministers being re-elected on their acceptance of office under the Crown. By the twenty-fifth section of the Act of 6 Anne c. 41, "If any member shall accept of any office of profit from the Crown during such time as he shall continue a member, his election shall be and is hereby declared to be void, and a new writ shall issue for a new election, as if such person so accepting was naturally dead, provided nevertheless that such person shall be capable of being again elected." By virtue of this provision, whenever a member accepts an office of profit from the Crown a new writ is ordered. The object of this enactment was the exclusion from Parliament of persons supposed to be under the influence of the Crown, and the vigour with which it has been enforced has from time to time added enormously to the expenses of members of Parliament. It is said that Sir GEORGE YONGE, who was first returned for the borough of Honiton in 1754, was returned to seven Parliaments and re-elected on his appointment to the offices respectively of Lord Commissioner of Admiralty (1766), Vice-Treasurer of Ireland (1782), Secretary at War (1782), and again in 1783 and (1794) Master of the Mint. The jealousy of the House of Commons which led to the passing of this Act has practically disappeared and a variety of statutes has removed the disqualification in the case of many offices under the Crown. But the statute, notwithstanding these amendments, requires the new Solicitor-General, elected for Parliament a few weeks ago, to at once offer himself for re-election, with the prospect of having to repeat his candidature a few months afterwards.

Personal Liability of Shareholders of Company Trading in Foreign Country.

THE AMERICAN courts have recently determined a question which was substantially the same as that which arose before the English Court of Appeal in *Risdon Iron and Locomotive Works v.*

Furness (1906, 1 K. B. 49). The defendant, who was domiciled in Chicago, was a shareholder in an insurance company which carried on a branch business in California. By the law of California every shareholder of a company, whether incorporated in California or elsewhere, trading within that State, is personally liable for such proportion of the company's debts as the amount of his shares bears to the whole of the subscribed capital of the company. The company having become insolvent, the plaintiff, who was a creditor of the company in California, sued the defendant in Chicago as being liable under the Californian law. It was strenuously argued that by carrying on business in California the company must be taken to have submitted to the operation of the local law. But the court held that there was nothing in the constitution of the particular company from which an authority by every shareholder to the company or its directors or agents to carry on business in a foreign country, so as to make the shareholder personally liable, could be implied. We do not know whether the decision in *Risdon Iron and Locomotive Works* was brought to the attention of the court. English cases appear to be cited with less frequency in the American courts than was usual some years ago. This is probably due to the multiplication of cases in the reports of the different States, which give the practitioner little leisure to search for authorities beyond the limits of the United States.

A Court for the Purpose of Deciding Upon the Validity of Election to the French Chamber.

M. FERNAND LABORI, the French advocate, well known in this country as well as in France for the part he took in the trial of DREYFUS, has given in the *Matin* the reasons which have induced him to resign his seat in the Chamber of Deputies. In this letter he refers to certain political reforms which, in his opinion, are of pressing importance; one of which is the establishment of a supreme court independent of political influences, to ensure the secrecy and sincerity of the vote. The validation of elections by Parliament, he affirms, is a mere farce. This opinion is of interest to Englishmen, who can remember the transfer of the jurisdiction over election petitions to judges of the superior courts. We are far from saying that the existing procedure is not capable of amendment, but we cannot think that there is the slightest prospect of a resumption by the House of Commons of the right of deciding upon the validity of all elections to its own body.

Gifts from Husband to Wife.

THE decision of EVE, J., in *Re Plumtree* (*ante*, p. 326), following that of SWINFEN EADY, J., in *Re Ellis's Settlement* (1909, 1 Ch. 618), suggests the propriety of expressly excluding from covenants for the settlement of after-acquired property gifts which are made during the coverture by the husband to the wife. In the earlier of these two cases a marriage settlement, made in 1882, contained a covenant for the settlement of "all the real and personal estate" to which the wife, or the husband in her right, should upon the solemnization of the marriage or at any time afterwards during the coverture "be or become absolutely entitled for any estate or interest whatever in possession or in reversion." There followed an exception of jewels and articles of personal use, savings and purchases out of separate income, and sums of money not exceeding £300. In 1907 the husband transferred into his wife's name certain securities belonging to himself worth about £50,000. They were intended as a free gift, and the husband gave evidence that he would not have transferred them had he known that they would become subject to the settlement. There were two infant children of the marriage who were amply provided for apart from the settlement.

Under these circumstances, an attempt was made to induce the court to declare that the securities were not bound by the settlement, and had it been possible to take into consideration the probable intention of the parties, it would have been natural to exclude them. One object of the settlement of a wife's property is to protect it against the husband, and certainly no such

protection is needed with regard to property which the husband during the coverture gives to the wife. Hence it was contended that the court ought, as a rule of construction, to hold that, unless there were express words to the contrary, gifts from the husband to the wife were not included in covenants for the settlement of after-acquired property.

The question is not devoid of authority, for in several cases the improbability of the parties intending to include gifts by the husband to the wife has been commented on, and in *Dickinson v. Dillwyn* (8 Eq. 546) MALINS, V.C., appeared to lay down a rule which went the length contended for in *Re Ellis's Settlement*. "On the broad ground of intention," he said, "I am of opinion that the words of the covenant never could have been intended to apply to property which the wife should acquire from her husband." But in that case the question did not arise with respect to property acquired during the coverture. The husband was dead, and he had by his will left all his property to his wife absolutely. The covenant referred to property acquired "at any time hereafter," and was not expressly limited to property acquired during the coverture; hence there was some ground for arguing that it extended to property acquired by the wife after the coverture had terminated. But it bound both the husband and wife to concur in settling the after-acquired property, so that on its face it purported to affect only property acquired during the joint lives of the spouses, and this was really sufficient to dispose of the question without relying on the general intention of the parties to the settlement. MALINS, V.C., recurred to the matter shortly afterwards in *Carter v. Carter* (L.R. 8 Eq., p. 556), and stated that he had decided *Dickinson v. Dillwyn* partly on the ground that the words "at any time hereafter" in the covenant referred only to the duration of the coverture; but he added: "I also decided it upon the great improbability that the contracting parties, contracting that future property should be subject to the settlement, should have intended that property which the husband should leave to the wife should be embraced in the covenant."

The question also arose recently in *Coles v. Coles* (1901, 1 Ch. 711), and JOYCE, J., decided it in accordance with the opinion of MALINS, V.C.; but there the settlement did not contain a covenant for settlement of after-acquired property, it merely assigned all the present and future property of the wife. Now, the effect of an assignment of future property is well understood. At law it has no operation at all, but if made for value it operates in equity as a covenant to assign, and so soon as the property is acquired the beneficial interest passes (*Holroyd v. Marshall*, 10 H. L. C. 191; *Collyer v. Isaacs*, 19 Ch. D. 342); and possibly in applying this doctrine to a marriage settlement it is possible to construe the implied covenant somewhat less strictly than an express covenant. At any rate, JOYCE, J., relied on the dictum quoted above from the judgment of MALINS, V.C., in *Dickinson v. Dillwyn* as to the improbability that gifts from the husband to the wife were meant to be included, and he held that such a gift was not brought into settlement by words purporting to assign future property.

In neither *Dickinson v. Dillwyn* nor *Coles v. Coles*, therefore, did the effect of an express covenant to settle after-acquired property upon a gift from the husband to the wife made during the coverture come in question; moreover, the dictum of MALINS, V.C., in the former case was really, as appears from *Carter v. Carter* (*supra*), aimed at testamentary dispositions made by the husband in favour of the wife, and not at gifts. *Coles v. Coles* was followed in Ireland in *Kingan v. Matier* (1905, 1 I.R. 272), on an express covenant to settle after-acquired property, but in this country the effect of such a covenant on a gift from husband to wife seems to have first arisen in *Re Ellis's Settlement* (*supra*), and SWINFEN EADY, J., decided it upon the ordinary rules relating to the construction of deeds. The business of the interpreter is certainly to ascertain the intention of the parties, but for this purpose he can have regard only to the words used, and to such extrinsic evidence as is admissible to determine the meaning of the words. The intention is the intention as appearing from the words used, not such intention as may appear to have been probable. COTTON, L.J., applied this principle to covenants for the settlement of after-acquired property in *Scholfield*

v. Spooner (26 Ch. D., p. 100): "Whatever the consequence may be, where the parties have entered into a covenant, we have nothing to do but to construe the covenant and give effect to the construction, however inconsistent it may be with what we may guess to have been the real intention of the parties." Acting upon this principle, SWINFEN EADY, J., in *Re Ellis's Settlement* held that the gift from the husband to the wife was within the covenant. The language of the covenant was wide enough to embrace the gift, and there were no words to exclude it. "I do not," he said, "find any rule of law or of construction that in the case of a covenant to settle after-acquired property, however wide the language, the court is bound to construe the covenant so as to exclude property given by the husband to the wife during the coverture."

The same question arose in *Re Plumtree* (*supra*), and was decided in the same way. The marriage settlement, which was made in 1878, contained a covenant by the husband and wife for the settlement of after-acquired property of the wife in the ordinary form, excluding sums of £200. EADY, J., pointed out that the object of a marriage settlement was not only the protection of the wife's property from the husband, in which case it might be anomalous to extend it to gifts from the husband; but also to protect the wife against herself, and to preserve the capital of her fortune for her issue. The inclusion of gifts from the husband to the wife was therefore, he concluded, not necessarily repugnant to the motive underlying the settlement, and the question was merely one of construction. Thus treating it, he had no difficulty in adopting the view taken by SWINFEN EADY, J., in *Re Ellis's Settlement*, and he held that a sum of £1,125 Grand Trunk £4 per cent. Debenture Stock, which had been given by the husband to the wife, was subject to the settlement. But although this may be correct as a matter of construction, for practical purposes it seems to be wrong. If the husband wishes the gift to be settled, he can do this when he makes the gift. There is no reason to fetter him by a covenant such as that in question. Hence in future it will be a prudent precaution to specify gifts from the husband among the property excepted from the covenant.

Reviews.

The Port of London.

THE PORT OF LONDON ACT, 1908; WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES, AND AN APPENDIX OF INCORPORATED STATUTES AND BYE-LAWS AFFECTING THE PORT. By R. W. HARPER, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited); Reeves & Turner.

This work presents in a convenient form the Port of London Act, 1908, and the various private Acts regulating the dock companies whose undertakings are transferred to the new Port Authority. Some other incidental statutes, such as the Public Authorities Protection Act, 1893, and the Thames Conservancy and other bye-laws and regulations are also included. In an introductory chapter the author discusses in some detail the question of "free water"—that is, the right of the consignee of goods to free delivery over the ship's side into a barge or lighter; this right, originally prevailing in the river, was apparently intended to be secured for vessels in dock by the various dock Acts, since these exempted lighters from rates or charges so long as *bond fide* engaged in discharging goods. But, as Mr. Harper points out, the case of *London and India Docks Co. v. Thames Steam Tug Co.* (1909, A. C. 15), and the two other cases which came before the House of Lords at the same time shewed that the protection was not so complete as had been supposed. He characterizes these decisions as unfortunate from the business point of view, and suggests that the Port Authority should obtain legislation to safeguard the "free water" position. The remainder of the introduction explains the provisions of the Act of 1908, and their application to the various interests affected by the dock companies, and the text of the Act itself is usefully annotated. The book is a reliable guide to the law now affecting the Port of London.

Students' Equity and Company Law.

AN EPITOME OF LEADING CASES IN EQUITY. FOUNDED ON WHITE AND TUDOR'S SELECTION. By W. H. HASTINGS KELKE, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. SECOND EDITION. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

AN EPITOME OF COMPANY LAW FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS.
By W. H. HASTINGS KELKE, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. SECOND
EDITION. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

The former of these volumes is intended to smooth the way for the student who is embarking on the study of equity. Whether it is convenient to found such a book on "White and Tudor" is a doubtful question. Notwithstanding its form, that work is invaluable to the practitioner, but for the student it is not to be recommended, save so far as reference to the cases will assist him as he works through Ashburner, or Snell, or Strahan. Mr. Kelke's book, however, is not, as its title might seem to denote, a condensation of the leading cases, but is a sketch of the main topics of equity jurisprudence. Thus in Chapter XII. the origin of equitable assignment is explained, and the manner in which an assignment or charge can be created, and the steps necessary to protect the title of the assignee, are pointed out; and attention is called to the rule that the assignee takes subject to equities. Moreover, the student will find the chapters on administration, mortgages, and specific performance—to mention these only—useful.

Company law is treated in the second of the above works under the four heads of Inception, Management, Dissolution, and Supplementary. The first head furnishes chapters on promotion, on the prospectus, and on the allotment of shares, all matters of primary importance for anyone who has to do with companies, and which the student should master. Under "Management" borrowing takes a prominent position, and Chapter VII. explains the requirements as to registration of charges and the nature of floating securities. The book forms a useful introduction to company law.

Civil Code of Japan.

ANNOTATED CIVIL CODE OF JAPAN. VOL. I. By J. E. DE BECKER, Solicitor and Legal Translator. London: Butterworth & Co.; Yokohama: Kelly & Walsh (Limited).

This is a formidable-looking volume of some 360 pages, printed on paper with a wide margin. Nevertheless, the text of the Code only reaches Article 398, about a third of the whole of the Civil Code. There are in existence at least two English translations of this Code, the entirety of which, printed by itself, makes a very modest volume that will almost go in the pocket. The peculiar value of the present book should, therefore, lie in the commentary or notes. These are, to an English lawyer, rather disappointing. A somewhat flattering introduction is written by Count Hayashi, formerly Japanese Ambassador in London, and the author himself, in his preface, says that the book is intended to furnish a simple and concise running commentary on the Code for the use of English-speaking persons, in the hope of bringing about a better appreciation of Japanese law. The book, however, gives one the impression of being an adaptation of a book written for Japanese, not English-speaking, persons. The author has lived twenty-three years in Japan, and has possibly got rather out of touch with the requirements of a book on law for the use of Englishmen. He professes to have based his book on a Japanese work, and the result is a completely foreign air about the commentary. Article 1 of the Code is: "The enjoyment of private rights commences at birth." No one writing at first hand for English readers would comment thus: "Death extinguishes all the relations of a person, and even a man who only yesterday fought courageously in the battle of life is like a faded leaf in autumn when he has been swept away by death one sad morning," &c. Again, what is called commentary is often a mere paraphrase that does nothing towards elucidating the text. There is no mention of any judicial interpretation of the text, though the Japanese courts must have done something in the way of construing the Code. One useful feature, however, consists of fairly numerous references to the German Civil Code. The actual text of the Japanese Code is interesting enough to any student of jurisprudence, and references to the German and French Codes (in their English translations) greatly increase this interest. The German Code has on the whole been followed rather than the French, but there is a general resemblance to continental rather than English law. Property is divided into moveable and immoveable, not real and personal, and there is no distinction between legal and equitable estate. Article 206 may be quoted as showing the resemblance between the Japanese and German Codes: "An owner has the right of freely using, receiving the profits of, and disposing of the thing owned within the restrictions of laws and ordinances." Article 903 of the German Code (Chung-Hui-Wang's translation) is: "The owner of a thing may, in so far as the law or the rights of third parties admit, deal with the thing as he pleases, and exclude others from any interference with it."

Books of the Week.

The Employers' Liability Act, 1880, and the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, with the Statutes Relating to, and Cases Decided on, the Previous Workmen's Compensation Acts in England, Scotland, and Ireland; the County Court Rules of Procedure under the Act of 1906; the Home Office Regulations and Forms; together with Notes and Cases Decided in the Canadian Courts, and an Appendix of Canadian Statutes. By His Honour Judge RUEGG, K.C., with the Canadian Notes by F. A. C. REDDEN, of the Ontario Bar, Solicitor. Eighth Edition. Butterworth & Co.

The Debentures and Debenture Stock of Trading and other Companies, with Forms, including Forms of Proceedings to Enforce Securities. By EDWARD MANSON, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. Butterworth & Co.

A Manual of Commercial Law. By E. AUSTIN FARLEIGH, LL.B (Lond.), Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

Oaths and Affirmations in Great Britain and Ireland: being a Collection of Statutes, Cases and Forms, with Notes and Practical Directions for the Use of Commissioners for Oaths and of all Courts of Civil Procedure and Offices Attached Thereto. By FRANCIS A. STRINGER, of the Central Office of the Supreme Court, assisted by J. JOHNSTON, of the King's Remembrancer's Department of the Central Office. Third Edition. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

Criminal Appeal Cases: Reports of Cases in the Court of Criminal Appeal, January 29th, February 4th, 5th, 11th, 1910. Edited by HERMAN COHEN, Barrister-at-Law. Vol. IV., Part III. Stevens & Haynes.

Correspondence.

Liability of Parent for Wilful Damage by Child.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—With reference to your remarks at p. 321 *ante*, may I point out (1) that the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, has been repealed; (2) the definitions of "child" and "young person" have been altered; and (3) the onus of proof shifted from the prosecution to the parent with reference to conducing to the commission of the offence!

The Children Act, 1908, is now the governing statute. A "child" now means a person who in the opinion of the court is under the age of fourteen years, and a "young person" who in the opinion of the court is of the age of fourteen years and under the age of sixteen years (section 128).

Section 99 provides that where a child or young person is charged before any court with any offence, and the court is of opinion that the case would be best met by the imposition of a fine, damages, or costs, the court may in any case, and *shall*, if the offender is a child, order that the fine, damages, or costs awarded be paid by the parent or guardian of the child or young person, *unless* the court is satisfied that the parent or guardian cannot be found, or that he has not conducted to the commission of the offence by neglecting to exercise due care of the child or young person (sub-section 1). The parent must be given an opportunity of being heard (sub-section 4).

It is now the usual custom in the police-courts to summon the parents as well as the children in the cases against children, and the form of summons prescribed is simply that A. B. (the child) has done so and so, and that C. D. is the parent. When thought desirable, the parents are also summoned in the cases against young persons.

You will observe that the section throws the onus of proof on to the parent with reference to the conducing to the commission of the offence, &c. It also enables the court to make such an order on the parent without convicting the child or young person (sub-section 3); and further, where a child is charged with any offence, the court may order his parent to give security for his good behaviour (sub-section 2). This is a somewhat extraordinary provision, as no proof of the offence seems to be needed.

In the case you refer to, where the father was ordered to pay for the church windows broken by his daughter, probably the magistrates were of opinion that the girl was under sixteen.

F. B. DINGLE.

The Court House, Sheffield, March 7.

[See observations under the head of "Current Topics."—Ed. S.J.]

It is announced that the Corporation of London have offered to place the Council Chamber at the disposal of the International Law Association for their conference, which is to be held from 2nd to 6th of August. The corporation also decided to hold a reception and conversation in the Guildhall in honour of the gathering in the first week in August.

Points to be Noted.

Practice.

Special Indorsement—Affidavit by Solicitor.—A foreign lawyer may specially indorse his writ against an English client for professional charges and disbursements. But the application for leave to sign judgment under ord. 14, r. 1, must be supported by an affidavit made by a "person who can swear positively to the facts." An affidavit by the plaintiff's English solicitor, based on letters from the plaintiff and from the defendant's solicitors, is merely an affidavit of information and belief, and will not support the application.—*LAGOS v. GRUNWALDT* (C.A., Nov. 2) (54 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 216; 1910, 1 K. B. 41).

Vendor and Purchaser Summons—Doubtful Title.—A vendor and purchaser summons should not be used to force a doubtful title on a purchaser. Where the vendor's title is objected to on the ground of difficulty of construction of a document, the proper way of proceeding is by originating summons, so that all parties may be bound; and if a vendor and purchaser summons be persisted in in such a case the application may be refused merely on this ground.—*RE NICHOLS AND VON JOEL'S CONTRACT* (C.A., Nov. 11) (1910, 1 Ch. 43).

Specific Performance—Remedies.—When a contract for the sale of land contains a provision that in case of default in payment of the purchase-money the vendor may forfeit the deposit and resell the property, and recover from the purchaser as liquidated damages the expenses of resale and any deficiency thereon, these remedies are not cumulative; and if the vendor resells he must give credit to the purchaser for the amount of the deposit, notwithstanding the form of order drawn up in *Griffiths v. Vesey* (54 W. R. 490; 1906, 1 Ch. 796).—*SHUTTLEWORTH v. CLEWS* (Joyce, J., Dec. 3) (1910, 1 Ch. 176).

Unsuccessful Bankruptcy Petition—Costs.—Rule 183 (1) of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1886, provides that all "proceedings under the Act down to and including the making of a receiving order shall be at the cost of the party prosecuting the same," but shall be paid out of the estate "when a receiving order is made." On the construction of this rule, the petitioner's responsibility for his own costs is absolute if the petition is unsuccessful, and the court's discretion as to costs does not arise.—*RE A DEBTOR* (No. 1103 of 1909) (C.A., Dec. 17) (54 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 217; 1910, 1 K. B. 313).

Retainer of Solicitor—Subsequent Lunacy of Client.—The authority of an agent (such as a solicitor retained in view of a threatened action) is determined by the death or lunacy of his principal. If the agent continues to act on that authority (as, for example, by entering an appearance and delivering a defence), in ignorance of the determination of it, he impliedly warrants its continued existence, and he is personally liable for any damages caused through his warranty to parties with whom he contracts or does business (as, for example, for the plaintiff's costs subsequent to the appearance). The Judicature Act, 1894, s. 1 (4), provides that in "matters of practice and procedure every appeal from a judge shall be to the Court of Appeal." This was a case within that section, and the appeal lay from the judge at chambers to the Court of Appeal, and not to the Divisional Court.—*YONGE v. TOYNBEE* (C.A., Nov. 12, 13, 15; Dec. 21) (1910, 1 K. B. 215).

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Court of Appeal.

SMITH'S ADVERTISING AGENCY v. LEEDS LABORATORY CO.
No. 1. 3rd March.

GAMING—LOTTERY—LIMERICK COMPETITION—MISSING WORDS—SOLUTIONS TO BE EXAMINED BY AN EXPERT LITERARY STAFF—ACTION BY ADVERTISING AGENTS TO RECOVER EXPENSES OF INSERTING ADVERTISEMENTS IN NEWSPAPERS.—ILLEGAL TRANSACTION—GAMING ACT, 1802 (42 Geo. 3, c. 119), s. 1.

The defendants were the proprietors of a patent medicine known as "Vitaloids." In 1908 they advertised through the plaintiffs, a firm of advertising agents, the conditions of Limerick competitions for which prizes were offered, and also the terms of a letter-writing competition in which competitors were invited to complete a letter in which blanks were left by adding missing words. The advertisements stated also that solutions would be examined by an expert literary staff. The plaintiffs, who had nothing to do with the making up of the advertisement, booked spaces for them in various newspapers. On an issue to decide whether the plaintiffs could maintain an action to recover their expenses from the defendants,

Held, affirming the decision of Walton, J., that the competition was a lottery and that the action was not maintainable.

Decision of the Court of Appeal in Blyth v. Hulton and Co. (Limited) (52 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 599; 24 Times L. R. 719) held to cover the present case.

Appeal by plaintiffs on an issue to decide whether they could maintain the action or whether the advertisements they had inserted in newspapers, acting as advertising agents for the defendants, which contained prize announcements for literary skill in Limericks, rendered the competitions lotteries and precluded the plaintiffs from suing the defendants in respect of work done with reference to them. Walton, J., who tried the action without a jury, held that the plaintiffs could not recover for any part of the work done on the principle laid down by the Court of Appeal in *Blyth v. Hulton and Co.* (52 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL 599, 24 T.L.R. 719). The defendants sold a patent medicine known as "Vitaloids." In 1907 they advertised their medicine in the ordinary way through the plaintiffs. In 1908 the defendants advertised the conditions of a Limerick competition, for which they offered large prizes, and also the terms of a letter-writing competition, in which the public were invited to complete a letter containing blank spaces by adding the missing words. It was contended in support of the appeal that this case was distinguishable from *Blyth v. Hulton & Co.* The ground of the decision in that case was that there was no time for any proper examination of the lines. The advertisements showed that there was to be here a genuine adjudication. Without calling on the respondents,

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J., said he was of opinion that the present case came within the principles on which *Hulton's case* was decided. The first question raised was whether the advertisements came within the ambit of the Lottery Acts which had been cited, and the answer depended upon whether the advertisements invited people to come in and take their chance of winning a prize. The advertisements were clearly of that kind. True, in *Hulton's case*, when one looked at the dates between which the examination was to take place, it was obviously impossible that any real examination could have taken place, and it was equally true that in the present case that feature was not so prominently present. But there was nothing in the advertisements to prevent the competition editor or his committee from awarding prizes without any reference whatever to the decisions of the expert staff, or without reference to the arbitrary will of those who made the final selection. Taking the advertisements as a whole, he was clearly of opinion that in truth and in fact it was not literary merit which was really to settle the final allotment of these prizes. With regard to the other point argued, namely, that as the plaintiffs merely acted as advertising agents, and obtained spaces in newspapers on the defendants' behalf, therefore as between the plaintiffs and the defendants the contract was good, his lordship's view was that, the advertisements being illegal, the plaintiffs were taking part in an illegal transaction, and therefore had no remedy in law against the defendants.

FARWELL, L.J., agreed. He thought the case fell within the principle laid down in *Barclay v. Pearson* (1893, 2 Ch. 154). The advertisements invited a gamble, and were a pure lottery, and *Hulton's case* was not distinguishable from the present case.

KENEDY, L.J., concurred. Appeal dismissed with costs.—COUNSEL, *Bankes, K.C., Lush, K.C., and R. F. Bankes* for the plaintiffs; *Gore-Browne, K.C., and R. E. L. Vaughan Williams; Leslie Scott, K.C., and Hugh Beazley* for the respective defendants. SOLICITORS, *W. S. Ash* for the plaintiffs; *W. J. & E. H. Tremellen; Helder, Roberts, Walton, & Giles, for Simpson, Thomas, & Co., Leeds*, for the defendants.

[Reported by ERSKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

Re PULLEN, Deceased. PARKER v. PULLEN. Warrington, J.
25th Feb.

ADMINISTRATION—MARSHALLING—ESTATE DUTY ON PERSONALTY—UNDISPOSED OF REALTY.

The usual order of administration of assets will not be departed from for the purpose of relieving undisposed of realty from the payment of estate duty on personality. Estate duty payable by the executor is a testamentary expense, and the order of administration in respect of the payment of testamentary expenses being the same as that adopted for payment of debts, the duty must be met out of undisposed of realty before resort is had to specifically bequeathed personality or to devised realty.

Shepherd v. Beetham (6 Ch. D. 597) discussed and distinguished.

The question raised by this adjourned summons was whether the testator's estate must be so marshalled as to relieve the real estate not disposed of by his will from payment of the estate duty, which by section 6, sub-section 2, of the Finance Act, 1894, the executor is rendered liable to pay, namely, duty in respect of the personality of which the testator was competent to dispose at his death. The position of the estate was this. There were some realty specifically devised, some realty not disposed of, some leaseholds and personality specifically bequeathed, and a certain amount of undisposed of personality. The most valuable item consisted of the personality which was disposed of. The undisposed of personality, that is, the general personal estate,

amounted to something over £2,000, and the funeral and testamentary expenses and debts, including in testamentary expenses the estate duty payable by the executors, came to about £4,800, which was about £2,800 more than the undisposed of general personal estate. The estate duty on the specifically bequeathed personalty amounted to something over £2,400, and had been paid with the funeral and testamentary expenses and debts. The undisposed of realty was of the value of about £2,600. It was said that if the ordinary course of marshalling assets were adopted in this case, and no distinction was made in respect of the estate duty, the result would be to throw on the undisposed of realty a portion, if not the whole, of the estate duty on the personalty.

WARRINGTON, J., in the course of his judgment, said: The order in which assets are administered for the purpose of paying debts is well known. General personal estate comes first, and then, omitting some items which are not material to the present purpose, the undisposed of realty comes as a fund out of which the debts are to be paid, and you do not resort to the specifically bequeathed personalty, or the devised realty, until you have exhausted those previous funds. Now that order of administration is the order adopted for the payment of debts. So far as I can see there is in the text books no express statement as to what is the order in regard to the payment of funeral and testamentary expenses, but funeral and testamentary expenses are paid in order before debts, and, therefore, I can see no distinction, and I think that the order of administration for the payment of both funeral and testamentary expenses, as well as of debts, is that I have mentioned. Further, it is now well settled that the estate duty payable by the executors is included in the expression "testamentary expenses," and it seems to me that that being so, in the absence of any authority to the contrary, it would be the duty of the court to hold that no difference has been made in the order of administration by the passing of the Finance Act, 1894, which, except so far as is done by section 8, subsection 4, with reference to the duty which is not payable by the executors, does not, as is well known, provide for the incidence of the duty. I think, therefore, that the contention of the heir-at-law, independently of authority, would fail, and that the estate duty must be paid like any other part of the testamentary expenses, and that the order of marshalling adopted in the case of debts is the proper order to adopt with regard to the estate duty. But the heir-at-law says that the case is not devoid of authority. It was decided in *Shepherd v. Beetham* (*ubi supra*) that probate duty ought not to be thrown on undisposed of realty. Now that case before the Vice-Chancellor was this: [Here his lordship set out the facts and the first portion of the decision, and continued:] So far there was nothing special, that was only following the well-known rule, but then he went on to decide that the specifically bequeathed property must exonerate the real estate from the probate duty. Now, so far as I can see, this case is absolutely unique. I can find no authority to the same effect, and the case is not referred to in the text books. It is not referred to in Seton, where one would expect to find any authority as to any departure from the ordinary rule of administration; nor is it referred to in Jarman, in Williams, or in Ingpen. It is only mentioned in Theobald on Wills, where it is not discussed, but the fact is mentioned that under that case the probate duty could not be thrown on the realty. It is material to see how the question was brought before the Vice-Chancellor. There is this note of the argument of Mr. Higgins. He urged that at any rate the probate duty should not fall upon the heir-at-law, and as far as the argument is concerned this is the only hint of the point having arisen at all. What the Vice-Chancellor says about it is this. He first of all deals with the ordinary rule so far as the personal estate is concerned. He then says this. [His lordship read from the words (at p. 603) "When I come to the real estate," to the words "being proved," and added:] I might just suggest on that, if that is correct, the same principle ought to have been applied to a considerable part of the testamentary expenses; for instance, the expenses of proving the will, which form a great part of the testamentary expenses. With those the heir-at-law has nothing to do. It is not my duty to say anything more about that, except that it is an obvious criticism upon the direction which he there gave. But, however that may be, assuming *Shepherd v. Beetham* to be good law as far as it goes, I think that I am not bound to follow it. That case relates to probate duty, not to estate duty. It relates to the state of affairs existing before the Land Transfer Act, 1897, a state of affairs which that Act in some respects materially modifies. I am not forgetting section 5, which provides that further duties shall not be thrown on the real estate. The position of the order of administration with reference to probate duty has been modified by the Land Transfer Act, 1897. I think the proper way of dealing with *Shepherd v. Beetham* is to say that it dealt with probate duty only, that it deals with a state of circumstances which no longer exists, and, on either ground, that I ought not to regard it as binding on me. My own opinion is that which I have already expressed, that the estate duty on personalty is part of the testamentary expenses, that the testamentary expenses ought to be paid out of the assets in the same order in which other deductions payable by the executors ought to be borne, and that the claim of the heir-at-law to have the assets marshalled in his favour, so as to create a distinction between the estate duty and the other testamentary expenses, ought not to be entertained.—COUNSEL, for the summons, *J. M. Gover*; for the heir-at-law, *H. H. King*; for an annuitant, *H. B. Edge*; for a specific legatee, *H. Freeman*. SOLICITORS, for all parties, *Woodroffes & Ashby*.

[Reported by PERCY T. CARRER, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re HUCKLESBY AND ATKINSON'S CONTRACT. Eve, J. 25th Feb.
VENDOR AND PURCHASER—EQUITABLE TITLE—RIGHT TO CALL FOR LEGAL ESTATE—INSUFFICIENCY OF ABSTRACT—REPUDIATION OF CONTRACT BY PURCHASER—RETURN OF DEPOSIT.

Where a vendor has no title at the date of the contract and has no power to clothe himself with a good title, the purchaser may repudiate the contract and need not give time. But where the vendor can make a good title and his only default is in not satisfying the purchaser that he has a right to convey, the purchaser is not entitled to repudiate the contract and to call for a return of the deposit.

This was an originating summons taken out by the purchaser asking for a declaration that the requisitions had not been properly answered, that a good title had not been shown in accordance with the contract, and for repayment of the deposit and the costs of investigating the title. By an agreement dated the 15th of March, 1909, the vendor agreed to sell and the purchaser agreed to buy a farm, the latter paying to the vendor a deposit of £120 and completion of the purchase being fixed for the 11th of October, 1909, on the vendor giving a satisfactory title of the property to the purchaser. The abstract of title was delivered on the 3rd of September, such abstract ending with a conveyance dated the 5th of January, 1897, to one B., in fee. The abstract was inclosed with a covering letter from the vendor's solicitors, stating that the farm had been recently purchased by the vendor with other property from B., and that the vendor proposed to arrange with B. to convey the property direct to the purchaser. By the requisitions on title delivered on the 8th of October, it was pointed out that the last deed abstracted was a conveyance to B., and the purchaser required the subsequent title to be abstracted and the deeds produced. By their answers to requisitions dated the 18th of October, the vendor's solicitors stated that B. would convey to the purchaser by the direction of the vendor. On the same day the purchaser's solicitors wrote to the vendor repudiating the contract on the ground that the vendor had not got the legal estate, and on the 30th of October caused this summons to be issued. A contract dated the 3rd of February, 1908, by B. to sell the farm to the purchaser as from the 11th of October, 1908, was exhibited to an affidavit of the vendor's solicitors in the present proceedings. For the purchaser it was contended that the abstract showed no title in the vendor as it omitted the contract with B., and it was too late to get in the legal estate after the date fixed for completion. On behalf of the vendor it was argued that the date for completion was not of the essence of the contract and that the purchaser had no right to repudiate the contract. The following cases were referred to, *Want v. Stallbrass* (L. R. 8 Ex. 175), *Green v. Sevin* (13 Ch. D. 589), *Compton v. Bagley* (1892, 1 Ch. 313), and *Re Baker and Selmon's Contract* (1907, 1 Ch. 238).

EVE, J., after stating the facts said: By his requisitions on title delivered on the 8th of October the purchaser required the title since 1897 to be abstracted. The answer to the requisition dated 18th of October was that B. would convey to the purchaser by the direction of the vendor. That was not a proper answer. The purchaser was entitled to have an abstract of the contract with B. On receipt of the answer the purchaser repudiated the contract, and the whole question is whether the purchaser was entitled to repudiate. The present case is different from the class of cases in which the vendor had no title and no power to clothe himself with a good title. In those cases the purchaser is entitled to repudiate the contract and need not give time. Those cases do not apply to a case like the present, where the vendor can make a good title and his only default is in not satisfying the purchaser that he has a right to convey. Under those circumstances is there any case which says that the purchaser is entitled to repudiate the contract? I do not think there is. The cases referred to fall far short of deciding that, and, therefore, if a purchaser under those circumstances repudiates the contract he does so at his own risk. It follows that the purchaser in the present case was not entitled to repudiate the contract on the 18th of October, and the repudiation was invalid. I cannot, therefore, make any order on the summons as asked, but as the vendor was wrong in not delivering an abstract of the contract with B., I must dismiss the summons without costs.—COUNSEL, *C. E. Bovill*; *Dighton Pollock*. SOLICITORS, *Gibson & Weldon* for *Hindmarsh & Mallett*, *Berwick-upon-Tweed*; *Mackrell, Maton, Godler, & Quincey*.

[Reported by S. E. WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—King's Bench Division.

TILLEY v. BOWMAN (LIM.). Hamilton, J. 11th Feb.

SALE OF GOODS—FRAUD OF BUYER—BANKRUPTCY—VENDOR'S RIGHT TO DISAFFIRM SALE—TITLE OF TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY.

Where a contract for the sale of goods is induced by fraud, and the seller elects to rescind the contract, the title to the goods may revert in the seller, although the election is made after the date of the receiving order.

The plaintiff claimed as trustee in the bankruptcy of *Kirkness & Co.*, in detinue for jewellery originally bought by the bankrupt from the defendants and alternatively for the return of £188 11s. 11d.

money paid by the buyer from time to time under the contract of sale. The facts as found by the learned judge were as follows:—On the 14th of November one Octavius Kirkness, a member of the firm of Kirkness & Sons, purchased from the defendants a diamond brooch and six diamond earrings for the credit price of £569. The contract of sale was induced by falsehoods told by Kirkness. Kirkness pawned the jewellery, but from time to time made payments on account of the purchase price up till the 1st of April, 1908, when he had paid £188 11s. 11d. At the beginning of May a receiving order was made against the firm of Kirkness & Sons, and after that the defendants became aware of the fact that the brooch had been pawned, and ultimately ascertained the full facts. On the 21st of May they elected to rescind the contract of sale as having been induced by fraud. They redeemed the jewellery from the pawnbroker, on payment of £300. It was contended on behalf of the plaintiff that at the time the receiving order was made the property in the jewellery was in Kirkness & Sons, and consequently vested in the trustee and had not been subsequently divested by any act of the defendants.

HAMILTON, J., in the course of his judgment, said the case of *Re Eastgate* (1905, 1 K. B. 465), was conclusive of the present case on the claim in detinue unless it could be distinguished on the ground that the rescission of the contract took place after the act of bankruptcy but before the receiving order, whereas in the present case it took place after the receiving order, but that did not seem to him to be a sound distinction. The artificial relation back of the trustee's title did not appear to him to make the position any different. It was said that as soon as the contract was rescinded the money paid under it, viz., £188 11s. 11d., was money had and received to the use of Kirkness, and subsequently to the use of the trustee. That was not disputed, but it was said that the damages liquidated at the sum of £300 for the fraud of Kirkness might, under the mutual dealing section of the Bankruptcy Act, be set off so as to extinguish the claim for £188 11s. 11d. Upon that point the case of *Jack v. Kipling* (9 Q. B. D. 113), relied upon by the defendants, was only distinguishable from the present upon the circumstance that in that case the contract had not been rescinded, whereas in the present case it had. It had been decided in *Lord v. Great Eastern Railway*, that the right to set-off as distinguished from the ascertainment of the amount to be set-off must be settled once and for all by the date of the receiving order, and it appeared to him that the suggested distinction was not a real one. He thought, therefore, that at the material time the position was that there was a contract still unrescinded on the one hand and a right to claim damages for fraud on the other. For the purposes of the present case the money claim by the trustee was really a claim as money paid under the contract, and therefore the defendants knew at the time the contract was made that the trustee would have a claim upon the acts done under the contract in the purchase of the jewellery which, owing to the fraud, was a claim for £188 11s. 11d., but the defendants had a claim for £300 damages for fraud, and therefore the facts were substantially the same as in *Jack v. Kipling* (*supra*). That case viewed in the light of the explanations given by Lord Russell, C.J., in *Palmer v. Day* (1895, 2 Q. B. 618) and Vaughan Williams, J., in *Re Mid-Kent Fruit Co.* (1896, 1 Ch. 567) appeared to him to be on all fours with the present case. He thought the claim for damages for misrepresentation, which in one sense was a claim in tort, should be allowed to come within the mutual dealing section of the Bankruptcy Act on the ground that the claim by the trustee was for the price of goods, and was, therefore, on the same ground as if the contract still existed, and that consequently there was a mutual dealing between the bankrupt and vendor. He had to consider for the purpose of section 38 of the Bankruptcy Act the position of the parties at the date of the receiving order, and accordingly they were not setting up and repudiating one and the same contract, but were properly claiming that the fraud which was practised in November, 1907, was a mutual dealing with all the subsequent claims that had to be made under that contract while it was in force. The result was that there would be judgment for the defendant.—COUNSEL, *Dobb; Attenborough*. SOLICITORS, *Julius A. White; S. J. Attenborough*.

[Reported by LEONARD C. THOMAS, Barrister-at-Law.]

Bankruptcy Cases.

Re SEED. Ex parte KING. Phillimore and Bucknill, JJ. 7th March. MONEYLENDER—CARRYING ON BUSINESS AT REGISTERED ADDRESS—LOAN CARRIED OUT BY POST—MONEYLENDERS ACT, 1900 (63 & 64 VICT. c. 51), s. 2, SUB-SECTION (1) (b)—BANKRUPTCY—PETITIONING CREDITOR'S DEBT.

A moneylender who carries out a loan through the post by correspondence from his registered address is carrying on his business at his registered address within the meaning of the Moneylenders Act, 1900, and a transaction so carried out is not void.

Appeal by a creditor from the dismissal of a petition by the Registrar of the County Court of Lancashire, holden at Preston. The petitioning creditor was a moneylender, whose registered trade name was King, and whose registered address was 11, Cork-street, London. He sent a circular to the debtor, who resided in Lancashire. Correspondence followed, the terms of a loan were arranged, and were carried out by the moneylender sending a promissory note to the debtor,

who signed it at his own house and returned it to Cork-street, whereupon the moneylender sent the debtor a cheque for the amount of the loan drawn on a London bank. The debtor having failed to pay off the loan, the moneylender presented a petition against him in the Preston County Court. The Registrar held that the loan transaction was void for illegality, and that consequently there was no petitioning creditor's debt. His decision was based upon *Gadd v. Provincial Union Bank* (1909, 2 K. B. 353), which he interpreted as deciding that a moneylending transaction is void unless the money has been paid over and the promissory note signed at the moneylender's registered address. The petitioning creditor appealed. Counsel for the appellant cited *Levene v. Gardner* (25 W. R. 711), *Jackson v. Price* (1910, 1 K. B. 143), and *Sadler v. Whitmore* (26 T. L. R. 255), and was then stopped by the court. Counsel for the respondent contended that no material part of the business of the loan had been transacted at the registered address of the moneylender; both the signing of the promissory note and the receipt of the money took place at the debtor's house. The Act required that a substantial part of the transaction should take place at the moneylender's office. He cited *Lazarus v. Gardner* (25 T. L. R. 499).

PHILLIMORE, J.—In this case it is alleged that the transaction in question was void because the moneylender did not comply with the requirements of section 2, sub-section (1) (b) of the Moneylenders Act, 1900, which requires that he shall carry on business at his registered address, and at no other address. The Act has been construed in several decisions, and it has been laid down that we have not to consider what the moneylender generally does, but whether he has carried out the particular transaction before the court at his registered address or no. In the present case the moneylender has sent out a circular giving his registered address, has entered into a correspondence giving his registered address, and the debtor has written to him at his registered address. If this transaction sins against the Act no transaction by post can stand. Remembering the penal consequences to the moneylender if this transaction be held void, it seems to be wrong to construe the Act in the way we are asked to by the debtor.

BUCKNILL, J., concurred. Appeal allowed.—COUNSEL, *Shearman, K.C., and T. E. Mansfield; E. W. Hansell*. SOLICITORS, *W. B. Glasier; Chester & Co., for J. Craven, Preston*.

[Reported by P. M. FRANKS, Barrister-at-Law.]

Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.

BULLUS v. BULLUS. Bigham, P. 21st Feb.; 1st March.

DIVORCE—WIFE'S PETITION—BILL OF COSTS AGAINST HUSBAND—ORDER TO PAY—NON-COMPLIANCE WITH ORDER—LEGACY DUE TO HUSBAND—INJUNCTION TO RESTRAIN PAYMENT—R.S.C. LXVIII. 1.

Where a husband had failed to obey an order to pay certain taxed costs incurred by wife in a suit for divorce, and where he was entitled to a legacy, the Court

Held, there was power to grant an injunction restraining the payment of the legacy over to him.

Motion for injunction. The facts necessary for this report are fully set out in the learned President's judgment.

March 1, BIGHAM, P., said: "I shall grant this injunction. The facts are as follows: A separation order was made against the respondent husband many years ago, under which he was ordered to make certain weekly payments to his wife, the petitioner, for her support. He then left the country and remained out of the jurisdiction, and so evaded the obligation put upon him. He has recently become entitled to a legacy under the will of a deceased relation, and has given a power of attorney to a solicitor to receive it for him. The wife has now petitioned for a divorce, and during the pendency of the divorce proceedings a bill of costs has been incurred by her which has been taxed against her husband. An order has been made against him for payment of the amount of the bill. He has paid nothing. The wife now applies for an injunction to restrain the trustees from paying over, and the husband from receiving, the amount of the legacy till further order. I doubted the jurisdiction of the court to grant the injunction. An order for payment of costs, if made in the King's Bench or Chancery Divisions, is final, in the sense that it is not interlocutory and can be enforced by a writ of *fi fa*, or by a writ of *elegit*, or by attachment of debts (Order 62, rr. 17 and 24), but it cannot, so far as I know, be enforced by granting an injunction to restrain a man from receiving his own property. It may, perhaps, be enforced by appointing a receiver, which, as pointed out by Lindley, L.J., in *Tyrrell v. Painton* (43 W. R. 163; 1895, 1 Q. B. 202), "operates as an injunction to restrain the defendant from himself receiving" the property; and apparently such an order may be made, although there is nothing at the moment to receive. *Tyrrell v. Painton* (*supra*) was a case in which the President of the Probate Division had made an order for payment of costs, and to enforce the payment the party entitled to the costs applied for and obtained the appointment of a receiver to collect the amount of an equitable reversionary interest under a will in the proceeds of the sale of some realty. It is true that the rules of the Supreme Court do not affect the proceedings in the Divorce Court (order 68, r. 1). Nevertheless, it is competent for the judge of this court to adapt the

practice of the court to those rules, *vide* *Giles v. Giles* (48 W. R. 238; 1900, P. 17), and I should do so in this case if it were necessary. But it is not necessary, for I find the practice of the court to be to grant such an injunction as is here asked for, *Sidney v. Sidney* (17 L. T., N. S. 9), *Newton v. Newton* (11 P. D. 11), and *Gillett v. Gillett* (38 W. R. 144, 14 P. D. 153). If I did not grant it I am satisfied that this man would evade the payment of the costs just as hitherto he has evaded his liability to pay maintenance. The injunction is not granted merely *quia timet*, but because the man's conduct satisfies me that without the injunction the legacy will escape as the man has escaped and justice will be defeated. An injunction was accordingly granted against the trustees, the respondent, and his agents. Costs of the motion were included in the order.—COUNSEL, *Willock, Grazebrook, Solicitors, Judge & Priestley*, for P. Baker & Co., Birmingham; *Timbrell & Deighton*, for Hooper & Taylor, Birmingham.

[Reported by DIOBY COTES-FREEDY, Barrister-at-Law.]

* * In connection with the report of the case of *Holden v. Holden and Pearson* (*ante*, p. 328) Mr. Percy J. Nicholls, of 17, Farringdon-street, London, writes that "it does not, I think, appear to be quite clear therefrom that the case was one in which I and my country client, Mr. Arthur Willey, of Leeds, were appearing for the petitioner, and that the error of judgment of the solicitor referred to was not that of either my country client or myself." It certainly was not.

Societies.

Selden Society.

The following is the annual report of this society for the year 1909:—
(1) Notwithstanding losses by death and resignation, the number of members slightly increases, and in 1909 reached 355.

(2) The council regret that, owing to the death of Mr. L. W. Vernon Harcourt and the ill-health and other engagements of Mr. I. S. Leadam, neither of the works in charge of these editors has yet been produced, and the arrangements for their publication will require some modification. Mr. Leadam is now actively engaged upon the revision of the second volume of "Select Cases in the Star Chamber," and it is hoped that this will shortly be published as the volume for the current year, 1910.

(3) Mr. W. C. Bolland has succeeded Mr. Vernon Harcourt as editor of the "Year Book of the Kentish Eyre of Edward II.," but the work has necessarily been delayed; and owing to the great mass of materials it has been found necessary to divide the subject into two volumes. Either the first volume of this Eyre or another volume of the regular Year Book series by Mr. J. G. Turner, which is well advanced, will be issued as the publication for the past year 1909.

Provisional arrangements (subject to contingencies) have been made for the following publications in subsequent years, viz., "Select Charters of Trading Companies," by Mr. C. T. Carr; "Kentish Eyre Year Book, Vol. II.," by Mr. Bolland; and other volumes of the "Year Books," by Mr. Turner.

The council have to announce, with much regret, the recent death of Professor Charles Gross, of Harvard, who was engaged on the second volume of "Select Cases in the Law Merchant." Fresh arrangements for the completion of this work will now be necessary, and its production will probably be delayed.

(4) The period of office of Sir Robert Romer, G.C.B., as president, has expired. The council have nominated in his place Mr. Walter C. Renshaw, K.C., who has kindly consented to accept the office. The council desire to record their gratitude to Sir Robert Romer for his services as president during the last three years.

(5) Under the rules the following members of the council retire by rotation, namely, Sir C. E. H. Chadwyck Healey, K.C.B., K.C., Sir John Gray Hill, the Hon. Mr. Justice Joyce, Mr. R. F. Norton, K.C., and Mr. Pennington. No nomination has been received under Rule 7 (a). Sir John Gray Hill desires to retire.

The council have nominated for election Mr. Edwin Freshfield, Sir C. E. H. Chadwyck Healey, K.C.B., K.C., the Hon. Mr. Justice Joyce, Mr. R. F. Norton, K.C., and Mr. Pennington.

(6) A casual vacancy in the council has occurred through the death of Mr. Atkinson. This has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Sidney O. Addy, of Sheffield.

(7) Under the powers conferred upon them by the rules as amended at the last annual meeting, the council have framed regulations for the supply of past volumes at a reduced rate. A copy of these regulations has been sent to all members, and it is hoped that all desirous of completing their sets of the society's publications will take advantage of the opportunity now offered.

(8) An abstract of the accounts, with the report of the auditors, is annexed. HERBERT H. COZENS-HARDY, Vice-President.

23rd of February, 1910.

Solicitors' Benevolent Association.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held at the Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, on the 9th inst., Mr. Maurice A. Tweedie in the chair, the other directors present being

Sir John Hollams and Messrs. W. C. Blandy (Reading), S. P. B. Bucknill, A. Davenport, J. A. Dawes, M.P., T. Dixon (Chelmsford), Walter Dowson, W. E. Gillett, C. Goddard, J. R. B. Gregory, L. W. N. Hickley, C. G. May, W. A. Sharpe, R. S. Taylor, and J. T. Scott (secretary). A sum of £405 was distributed in grants of relief, ten new members were admitted, and other general business was transacted.

City of London Solicitors' Company.

At the ordinary annual general meeting of the City of London Solicitors' Company, held at the Pewterers' Hall, Mr. J. B. Hartley (Messrs. Blyth, Dutton, Hartley, & Blyth) and Mr. T. H. Wrensted (Messrs. Wrensted, Hind, & Roberts) were elected to fill the vacancies on the court caused by the death of Sir John Bamford Slack and the retirement of Mr. Howse by rotation. Sir William J. Crump, who also retired by rotation, was re-elected. Mr. Albert S. Hicks (Messrs. Hicks, Walters, & Co.) was re-elected hon. auditor.

At a meeting of the court held subsequently, Sir Homewood Crawford (the City Solicitor) was re-elected Master for the ensuing year. Mr. John C. Holmes was re-elected Senior Warden, and Sir William J. Crump Junior Warden. Mr. A. W. Daunay was re-elected hon. solicitor, and Mr. Hugh D. P. Francis was re-elected clerk.

Law Students' Journal.

Law Students' Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—March 8.—Chairman, Mr. G. C. Blagden.—The subject for debate was: "That the case of the *South Eastern Railway Co. v. Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers* (1900) (*Limited*) (1910, 1 Ch. 12) was wrongly decided." Mr. C. W. Hill opened in the affirmative; Mr. A. C. Dowding seconded in the affirmative; Mr. A. C. Crane opened in the negative, Mr. C. G. Batley seconded in the negative. The following members continued the debate: Messrs. H. F. Rubinstein, Pleadwell, Meyer, Blackwell, and Burgis. The motion was lost by twelve votes.

Companies.

Equity and Law Life Assurance Society.

The annual general meeting of the Society was held on Monday at the Society's House, No. 18, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

The report, which disclosed a very favourable record for the year, stated that the new business amounted to £1,045,579 under 547 policies of which £685,954 had been retained by the society.

The gross new premiums amounted to £46,691.

The amount of the total assurances in force at the end of the year was £12,073,514.

The amount received from interest and dividends was £156,481.

Excluding reversions, outstanding premiums and interest and cash at bank, the funds were invested at the end of the year to produce £4 4s. 9d. per cent.

The claims by death under 131 policies amounted to £219,649, and 117 endowment assurances amounted to £126,173 matured.

The life assurance fund increased by £128,328, and amounted at the end of the year to £4,641,252.

The expenses of management, including commission, amounted to only £10 11s. per cent. of the premium income.

The directors propose shortly to present a bonus report in respect of the thirteenth quinquennium recently completed which is expected to give general satisfaction.

Star Life Assurance Society.

The Report for 1909 shows that during the year 1,724 policies were issued for sums assured amounting to £1,008,129, of which £291,922 was reassured with other offices, leaving the net new business at £716,207. Claims by death arose under 839 policies, and amounted to £302,162. The sum of £121,109 was also paid out on account of matured endowment policies. The premium income of the society amounted to £512,772, and the amount received on account of interest, dividends, and rents was £260,591, being at the average rate of £4 1s. 4d. upon the funds of the society.

The *Standard* publishes the ages of some of the older Judges of the Supreme Court, as follows:—Mr. Justice Lawrence, 78; Mr. Justice Grantham, 75; Mr. Justice Jelf, 73; the Master of the Rolls (Sir Herbert Hardy Cozens-Hardy), 72; Mr. Justice Joyce, 71; Mr. Justice Bigham (retired), 70; Mr. Justice Bray, 68; Lord Alverstone (Lord Chief Justice), 68; Mr. Justice Lawrence, 67; Mr. Justice Ridley, 67; Lord Justice Fletcher-Moulton, 66; Lord Justice Farwell, 65; Mr. Justice Sutton, 65; Lord Justice Buckley, 65; Mr. Justice Bucknill, 65; Mr. Justice Phillimore, 65; Mr. Justice Walton, 65; Lord Justice Kennedy, 64; Lord Loreburn (Lord Chancellor), 64; Mr. Justice Darling, 61.

Obituary.

Mr. B. S. Currey.

Mr. Benjamin Scott Currey, solicitor, of Derby, died last week. He was the son of the late Mr. Benjamin Currey, one of the clerks of the table in the House of Lords, and who also carried on business as a solicitor in Great George-street, Westminster. Mr. B. S. Currey was educated at Eton. He was articled to his brother, and was admitted in 1852, and soon afterwards entered into partnership with the late Mr. John Barber, of Derby, a solicitor of eminence in the county. Subsequently Mr. Currey took into partnership with him one of his sons, and the firm is now known as Barber, Currey & Currey. Mr. B. S. Currey was Steward of the Manor of Castle Donington, clerk to the Lord Lieutenant of Derbyshire, clerk to the visiting committee of the County Asylum, and clerk to the Sir John Port Charity (Repton School), and at his death, and on many occasions previously, he was under-sheriff of Derbyshire.

Legal News.

Appointment.

Mr. HERBERT DALE DOUBLE, solicitor, of 91, Fore-street, London, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Double was admitted in November, 1903.

Changes in Partnerships.

Admission.

Messrs. Blyth, Dutton, Hartley & Blyth, solicitors, of 112, Gresham House, Old Broad-street, London, have taken into partnership, as from March 1, 1910, Mr. EDWIN ERNEST STANLEY WRIGHT, who was articled to their former partner, Mr. Frederick Dutton, in 1897, and has been with them since that date. The name of the firm will continue unchanged.

Dissolutions.

DAVID COCHRANE, CHARLES EDWARD WHITEHOUSE, and EDWIN CRIPWELL solicitors (Cochrane & Co.), Birmingham. Feb. 28. So far as concerns the said Charles Edward Whitehouse, who retires from the said firm.

ALLAN BRUCE LEMON and ROBERT WINSKELL, solicitors (Lemon & Winskell), Newcastle-upon-Tyne and South Shields. Feb. 28. [Gazette, March 4.]

Information Required.

CAROLINE LONSDALE, Deceased.—Any solicitor or other person having the custody of a Will of the deceased, late of 13, Markham-square, but formerly of 31, Oakley-street, Chelsea, or of any material document affecting her estate, is requested to at once communicate with Messrs. Corsellis & Berney, 64, East-hill, Wandsworth, S.W.

MAX NEUSTADT, Deceased, late of the Victoria Hotel, Northumberland-avenue.—Anyone knowing of the existence of a Will of the above deceased will please communicate with Messrs. Hicks, Arnold, & Mozley, 35, King-street, Covent-garden, solicitors.

General.

The Royal Assent was given by commission on Tuesday to the Treasury (Temporary Borrowing) Act and the War Loan Redemption Act.

The report of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, which has just been issued, draws attention to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws relative to the functions of the Charity Commissioners, especially in regard to the recording and registration of charities, both endowed and other. The Poor Law Commission recommended:—"That the Charity Commission be enlarged, and that there be assigned to it two departments of work, the supervision of endowed charities on the lines of the Charitable Trusts Acts and the registration of voluntary charities or societies which hold any property in land or houses, by purchase or as leasehold, or are the tenants of any property under yearly or other agreements, and that the staff of the Commission should be strengthened so as to fulfil all the various additional duties that may devolve upon them: (1) As a centre for the registration of Voluntary Charities; (2) in assisting in the preparation of schemes for the establishment of Voluntary Aid Councils and for registering such schemes; (3) in assisting in the preparation of schemes for the establishment of Voluntary Aid Committees, and for registering and supervising their administration; (4) in the scrutiny of accounts and statements relating to Voluntary Aid Councils and Committees; (5) in the supervision of other schemes; and (6) in the scrutiny of the accounts of endowed and registered charities." A total number of 27,993 charities had been recorded in the Commissioners' Register on December 31 last.

The annual general meeting of the Selden Society will be held in the Council Room, Lincoln's Inn Hall, on Wednesday, March 16, 1910, at 4.30 p.m.

Mr. Justice Warrington was unable to take his seat in the Chancery Division on Saturday last owing to a chill, and up to Thursday he had not returned to the bench.

The London County Council, acting upon its decision to publish some of the documents of interest in its possession, has issued the first two volumes of the proposed series. These contain the first instalment of the Court Rolls of the Manor of Tooting Bec, of which the council is lord, and the minutes of the Surrey and Kent Commission of Sewers for the years 1569-1579. The court rolls now published date from 1394 to 1422. Some still earlier rolls are in the possession of King's College, Cambridge, and these, by permission of the college authorities, are reproduced in an appendix. The publishers are Messrs. P. S. King and Son, Great Smith-street, Westminster.

In moving the first reading of the Bill relative to the two additional judges of the King's Bench Division, the Lord Chancellor said: "I beg leave to bring in a very short Bill, which I believe to be entirely non-controversial. Last year a Joint Committee of both Houses was appointed to consider the condition of the business in the King's Bench Division. That committee sat and made the unanimous recommendation that two fresh judges of the King's Bench Division should be for the time appointed, but they did not recommend that the additional judges should be permanent unless, after further experience, Parliament should so decide. That was not exactly my view, because I thought Commissioners would suffice, but I thoroughly and loyally accept the preference expressed by the Joint Committee, and this Bill is brought in for the purpose of carrying out literally the recommendation I have read to your lordships. There is one other part of the Joint Committee's report, to my mind very valuable, relating to other recommendations for the improvement of business in that division. I should have liked to include that in this Bill, but the committee thought the appointment of the judges ought to be proceeded with at once. I cannot conceal from myself that some of the other part of the report may be controversial, and I wish to confine myself to the non-controversial proposals. The Bill will be printed and circulated, and, inasmuch as undoubtedly time presses, I shall try, if the House after seeing the Bill do not object, on Monday or Tuesday next to get the assent of the House to its passing through all its stages, so that we may get the Bill through at once."

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice JOYCE.	Mr. Justice SWINFER EADY.
Monday ... Mar. 14	Mr Sygne	Mr Church	Mr Greswell	Mr Theod
Tuesday 15	Goldschmidt	Synges	Real	Church
Wednesday 16	Greswell	Goldschmidt	Borror	Synges
Thursday 17	Real	Greswell	Leach	Goldschmidt
Friday 18	Borror	Real	Farnor	Greswell
Saturday 19	Leach	Borror	Bloxam	Real
Date.	Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.	Mr. Justice NEVILLE.	Mr. Justice PARKER.	Mr. Justice EVE.
Monday ... Mar. 14	Mr Leach	Mr Goldschmidt	Mr Borror	Mr Bloxam
Tuesday 15	Farnor	Greswell	Leach	Theod
Wednesday 16	Bloxam	Real	Farnor	Church
Thursday 17	Theod	Borror	Bloxam	Synges
Friday 18	Church	Leach	Theod	Goldschmidt
Saturday 19	Synges	Farnor	Church	Greswell

COURT OF APPEAL.

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF APPEALS FROM ALL DIVISIONS.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1910.

Set down to February 28th, 1910.

The Appeals or other business proposed to be taken will, from time to time, be announced in the Daily Cause List.

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

(General List.)

In re William Stevens dec Stevens v Stevens and ors appl of debts from order of Mr. Justice Neville (set down Nov 25 1908)

Attorney-General v Grand Junction Canal Co appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Oct 27 1909 (s o Easter)

Stubbs v Slater & Bond appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Neville and cross-notice by debts dated Nov 27 1909 (set down Dec 3 1909)

Worthington & Co ld v Abloft appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Eve (set down Dec 8 1909) (s o not before March 11)

In the Matter of an Indenture of Partnership &c Dommett v Griffin appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Dec 13, 1909) (s o March 9)

In re George Hodges dec Hodges and ors v Hodges and ors appl of deft J A Hodges from order of Mr Justice Warrington (set down Dec 20 1909) (s o Easter)

In the Matter of the Estate of Charlotte Mason dec Mason and ors v Mason and ors appl of defts Jean Sturt from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Jan 12 1910)

In re Alice Need dec Hardcastle and ors v Hardcastle and anr appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady (set down Jan 12 1910)

In re Francis Freeman dec Hope v Freeman appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Jan 13 1910)

Henry Gardiner Atkinson and ors v Charles Britton appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Neville (set down Jan 18 1910)

Green v Howell appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Neville (set down Jan 26 1910)

Thorne v Johnston and ors appl of deft Bowman from judgt of Mr Justice Neville (set down Jan 27 1910)

Dover ld v Nurnberger Celluloid-waren Fabrik Gebruder-Wolff appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Warrington (set down Jan 31 1910)

Smith v Gumbleton appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Neville (set down Jan 31 1910)

In the Matter of an Order of Exchange dated Aug 28 1890 Lord Elcho v Andrews appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Neville (set down Feb 3 1910)

In re J S Charlton dec Charlton v Staggs appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington (set down Feb 8 1910)

Wade v The Oxford ld appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Feb 9 1910)

In re Francis Freeman dec Hope v Freeman appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Feb 11 1910)

In re Lesley William Alexander dec Bathurst v Greenwood and ors appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Feb 15 1910)

In re Charles Blake dec Taylor v Blake Taylor v Blake appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Joyce (set down Feb 16 1910)

In re John Russell dec Purkiss and anr v Russell and ors appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Eve (set down Feb 17 1910)

Hansen v Spalding & Bros appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Parker (set down Feb 26 1910)

E J Sartorius (married woman) and G C Sartorius v A B Ross and ors appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Warrington (set down Feb 25 1910) produce order (query notice of appeal)

FROM THE CHANCERY AND PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

International Co of Mexico and anr v Mexican Land and Colonisation Co ld appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Eve (set down Jan 27 1910)

Bibby & Baron ld and ors v Samuel Duerden appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Eve (set down Feb 25 1910) March 3 Same v Strachan & Henshaw ld and anr appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Eve (set down Feb 25 1910) March 3

Divorce Scharrer J H (petnr) v Sharrer H T (respt) appl of respt from order of The President (set down Feb 26 1910)

FROM THE PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(General List.)

In re the Estate of A B Harvey dec H A Harvey and anr v S Harvey and two infants appl of M A Floyd from order of the President for a new trial (set down Feb 15 1910)

FROM THE COUNTY PALATINE COURT OF LANCASTER.

(Interlocutory List.)

In re John Gardner Sykes dec Sykes and ors v Sykes and ors appl of plffs from order of The Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster (set down Feb 10 1910)

(Final List.)

Refuge Assce Co ld v Taylor appl of deft from judgt of The Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster (set down Dec 31, 1910)

Naylor and ors v Brynn Hall Colliery Co ld and ors appl of defts from judgt of The Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster (set down Jan 29 1910)

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Final and New Trial List.)

Great Central Ry Co v Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of applicants from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, the Hon A E Gathorne-Hardy and Sir James Woodhouse (set down Feb 26, 1909) (s o for Mar 8)

In re the Copyright Act, 1842 Trevor-England and Thomas Charles Martin (applicants) v A Brown & Sons ld (respts) appl of applicants from judgt of Justices Darling and Channell (set down April 14, 1909) (s o till trial of issue)

The Mayor & Co of Kingston-on-Thames (applicants) v Baverstock and ors (respts) appl of applicants from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Jelf and Sutton (set down July 2, 1909) (s o Mar 13)

Humphrey v Furber appln of deft for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Sutton and a special jury, Winchester (set down July 15, 1909)

Jones v Great Central Ry Co appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Bucknill and a special jury, York (set down July 16, 1909) (s o day to be fixed)

Marks v Skinner and ors appln of plffs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Lawrence and a special jury, Middlesex (set down July 31, 1909) (security ordered) (s o not before March 8)

The King v The Board of Education appl of respts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Darling and A T Lawrence (Divisional Court) (set down Aug 10, 1909) Same v same appl of respts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Darling and A T Lawrence (Divisional Court) (set down Aug 10, 1909) (s o day to be fixed)

Ching v Surrey County Council appln of plfff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Bucknill and a common jury, Guildford (set down Sept 23, 1909) (s o for Mr. Commissioner Avory)

Gonde v Johnson appl of plfff from judgt of Mr Commissioner Avory, KC, without a jury, Hertford (adjd to London) (set down Oct 8, 1909)

Weiner v Owen and Robinson ld appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Bray and a special jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 8, 1909) Weiner v Middleton & Pollard ld appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Bray and a special jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 8, 1909) (s o March 4)

Wojciechowski v Mayor, &c. of Paddington appln of plfff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Coleridge and a common jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 9, 1909)

Skinner v Andrews & Hall appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Sutton, without a jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 10, 1909)

Davis and anr v Barclay and anr appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, without a jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 13, 1909)

George Bowles Nicholls & Co ld v Knapman appl of deft from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice, without a jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 15, 1909)

Roberts and ors v Hickman & Co appl of plffs from judgt of Mr Justice Hamilton, without a jury (set down Nov 15, 1909)

Clemetson v Easy Poise ld appl of plfff from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 16, 1909)

Skipper and anr v Holloway and anr appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, without a jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 23, 1909)

Macdonald and wife v Higgins and wife appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 24, 1909)

Staffordshire Financial Co ld v Valentine appln of deft for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex (set down Nov 24, 1909)

Grindell v E Lloyd & Sons ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell (set down Dec 2, 1909)

Argentine Tierra Del Fuego Exploration Co ld v The British and Argentine Corpn ld appl of plffs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, without a jury (set down Dec 6, 1909) (security ordered, Jan 27, in 2 months)

Mayor, &c. of Wandsworth v Wilde and ors appl of defts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice, without a jury, Middlesex (set down Dec 8, 1909) (s o March 14)

Anderson v Saunderson & Co ld appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex (set down Dec 10, 1909) (security ordered, Feb. 23, in 3 weeks)

In the Matter of The Arbitration Act, 1889, and In the Matter of an Arbitration between John Barker & Co ld and Beuveuisti Vidal appl of B Vidal from judgt of Justices Darling and Phillimore (Divisional Court) (set down Dec 16, 1909)

Maude v Lumb appln of deft for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, at trial before Mr Justice Bucknill and a special jury, Leeds (set down Dec 20, 1909)

Anns v Walker appln of deft for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury Middlesex (set down Dec 20 1909 (s o Easter)

Vasunaras v Ellerman Lines ld appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt at trial before Mr Justice Bray and a special jury Liverpool (set down Dec 21 1909)

Bentley v Norris appl of E Pilbrow from judgt of Mr Justice Sutton without a jury Middlesex (set down Dec 21 1909)

Keates Applicant v Lewis Merthyr Consolidated Collieries respts appl of applicant from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling (set down Dec 21 1909)

Byatt and anr v Krieger Electric Carriage Syndicate ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury Middlesex (set down Dec 22 1909) (s o March 7)

In the Matter of an Arbitration between Levy Bros and Knowles ld and Grossman et Cie appl of applicants from judgt of Mr Justice Bray without a jury Middlesex (set down Dec 22 1909)

Kuller v Lucas and anr appl of plfff from judgt of Justices Darling and Pickford (Divisional Court) (set down Dec 23 1909)

Ayriss v Bond appl of plfff from judgt of Justices Darling and Phillimore (set down Dec 24 1909)

Clissold v Crutchley appl of plfff from judgt of Justices Darling and Phillimore (set down Dec 24 1909)

Quintano v Petty and ors appln of deft Lee Dillon for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt at trial before Mr Justice Lawrence and a common jury Middlesex (set down Dec 30 1909)

Morris v Carnarvon County Council appl of defts from judgt of Justices Darling and Phillimore (set down Jan 6 1910)
 Moss v Elphick appl of plttf from judgt of Justices Darling and Pickford (set down Jan 10 1910)
 Cluse v Draysey appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt at trial before Mr Justice Jelf and a common jury Birmingham (set down Jan 13 1910)
 Frances Bamfield v Goole and Sheffield Transport Co ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Walton without a jury Leeds (set down Jan 15 1910)
 Smith Advertising Agency v Johnston appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Bucknill without a jury Middlesex (set down Jan 20 1910)
 Stanley v Munt Bros ld appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury Middlesex (set down Jan 20 1910)
 Kerrison v Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Hamilton without a jury Middlesex (set down Jan 27 1910)
 Webb v Grundle and anr appln of debt Grundle for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a common jury Middlesex (set down Jan 27 1910)
 Bowles v Woolner and In re an Issue Forster v Baker appl of plttf in Issue from judgt of Mr Justice Bray special case (set down Jan 31 1910)
 Macnaghten v The Proprietors of The Stage appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a special jury Middlesex (set down Feb 1 1910)

(To be continued.)

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.—CHANCERY DIVISION.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1910.

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF CHANCERY CAUSES FOR TRIAL OR HEARING.

Set down to February 28th, 1910.

Before Mr. Justice JOYCE.
 Retained Matters.
 Craven v Craven fur con and 2 adjd sums
 In re Granite Corpn ld Mortlock v The Company adjd sums
 In re Same Same v Same adjd sums
 In re Wilkinson's Settlement Hind v Leman adjd sums

Petition.
 In re Neate

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
 Attorney-Gen. v Andover Corpn Wiseman v Patz act (s o for discovery)
 Rome v Stuart act
 Smith-Bosquet v Smith act (s o Easter)
 In re Treherne Treherne v Treherne act (not before April 12)
 In re United Kingdom Debenture Bank ld Molony v The Company act
 Barnett v Barnett act (not before March 14)
 Cayford v Stevens act, counter-claim and m f j
 Convelas v Wilkinson act (not before April 1)
 In re Pollard, dec Willison v Young action
 Locke and Co (Newland) ld v Richardson act pt hd (s o to March 3)
 Horsfall Destructor Co v Mayor, etc., of Portsmouth act (s o Easter)
 Attorney-Gen v East Surrey Water Co act (s o till Easter Sittings)
 Morley v Smith act (not before March 14)
 Piper v M N Syndicate ld act and counter-claim (stayed for interrogatories)
 Baslow v Denholm act pt hd (s o to March 10)
 Stringer v Neely act (s o Easter Sittings)
 Reynolds v Ilchester act
 Slazenger v A Burrow and Co act
 Wilson v Kelland act (not before March 15)

Brook v Auty act
 Lane and Chaplin v Lane act (fixed for March 7)
 Williams v Williams act (s o Easter)
 Enever v Middleditch act and counter-claim (not before March 14)
 Fawns v Cave-Browne-Cave act
 Brilliant Sign Co (1907) ld v Jones act
 Farr v Swales act
 De Renzy v Galindez Bros. act
 In re Wilkinson Ratcliffe v Wilkinson act
 Manchester and Liverpool District Banking Co v Wood act
 Davies v Hughes act
 Greenwood v The Rochdale Skating Rink Co ld act
 Ford v Rixon act
 Blanket v J D Pitcher and Son ld act
 Laskey v Skippon act and m f j
 Watts v Everitt Press Manufacturing Co act
 Bechstein v Barker and Barker act
 Wisotzky v Goldstein act
 Frost c Richardson act
 Albiston v Lees act
 Giles v Jackson act

Before Mr. Justice SWINFEN-EADY.

Retained by Order.
 Adjourned Summonses.
 In re Hugh Pigot, dec Monckton v Allcroft adjd sums
 In re James Wells, dec Dickie v Monson adjd sums
 Platt v Rowe adjd sums

Companies (Winding Up) Motion.
 New York and Continental Line (for taxation—s o from December 14th, 1909 to Hilary Sittings, 1910)

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
 Harrison v Mander act (restored) pt hd (s o till March 8)
 Jupp v Martin act and counter-claim (not before March 17)
 In re John Medler, dec Dunn v Drew act (not before Easter)

In re James Daniels, the elder, dec Weeks v Daniels act
 Doble v Spaendonck act (pt hd (s o till March 7)
 Kyle v Gillespie act
 Muralo Co v W R Taylor and Co act
 Gill v Brooks act
 Deterding v Dack act
 Kock v Spaul act (s o till March 31)
 Atkinson v Hucklesby act
 Russell v Thackeray act
 In re Patent and Designs Act, 1907 In re Letters Patent, No. 1466 of 1908 granted to the Consolidated Brake Co petition for revocation
 Schweder v Gardner and ors act (without pleadings)
 Attorney-Gen v The Narberth Urban District Council act
 Bell v London and South Western Bank act
 Rickard v Graham act and counter-claim
 Ward v Leslie act and counter-claim
 Hickman v Thackeray act
 Owen v Jones act
 In re Hodgson Hodgson v Hodgson adjd sums (with witnesses)
 St Mungo Manufacturing Co v Viper Recovering Co act
 Earl of Onslow v Grant act
 Rhodesia Goldfields v Partridge act
 Willmott v London Road Car Co act and counter-claim
 Chantrell v Cheshire act and counter-claim
 Bacon v Walke act
 Scrase v Pride act
 Hauke Bros and Gibson v E Ashford and Co and In re Hauke Bros and Gibson's Design, No. 548,928, and In re the Patent and Designs Act, 1907 act and motion
 Encinillas Mines ld v Anglo-American Syndicate act (s o Easter)
 New Lombardian Permanent Building Soc, No 16 v Josephson action, counter-claim and m f j
 Hopley v Tarvin Parish Council act and counter-claim
 Attorney-Gen v W H Smith and Son act
 Deans v Chambers act
 Hennige v Brambley act
 Swan v Loughran act and counter-claim
 Beatty v Courage act and counter-claim
 Thomas v Wintle act

Before Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.

Further Considerations.
 In re Morgan Thomas David, dec Morgan v Evans fur con (s o generally—retained)
 In re S. W. Wheeley, dec Harward v Corrigan fur con
 In re Samuel Butler, dec Butler v Butler fur con

Action for Trial (with Witnesses).
 Retained by Order.

Attorney-Gen v Chandos Land and Building Soc act (for March 15, subject to anything pt hd)

Adjourned Summonses.
 In re Sir Samuel Wilson, dec Wilson v Wilson adjd sums (s o Easter)
 In re Thomas Clayton, dec Clayton v Clayton adjd sums

In re Bevan's Settlement Bevan v Bradshaw adjd sums (s o generally)
 In re Hope's Settled Estates adjd sums
 In the Matter of a Deed of Assignment (George Wells) and In re a claim by The Halifax Joint Stock Banking Co ld adjd sums (with witnesses)
 In re Thurston, dec Caudle v Thurston adjd sums
 In re Sarah Jane D'Esterre, dec D'Esterre v Roberts adjd sums
 In re Henry Purdue, dec Palmer v Purdue adjd sums
 In re George Bassett's Trust Dyson v Sheffield Corpn adjd sums
 In re The Estate of G A Hardy, dec Battie v Matthewman adjd sums
 In re M M Nettlefold, dec Martin v Martin adjd sums
 In re W S Wheeley, dec Harwood v Corrigan adjd sums and fur con
 In re Rooney (the Elder), dec Rooney v Rooney adjd sums
 In re J B Litchfield, dec Horton v Jones adjd sums
 Havana Cigar and Tobacco Factories ld v Tiffin (1905) ld adjd sums
 In re W A L Symons, dec Boursot v Hall adjd sums
 In re Symons' Trusts Cohen v Boursot adjd sums
 In re F. Schlette Lumley v Schlette adjd sums
 In re J P Sawyer, dec In re E J Bray, dec Andrew v Pearn and ors adjd sums
 In re G K Morgan, dec Dowson v Davey adjd sums
 In re Thomas Treweeke, dec Robinson v Robinson adjd sums
 In re Thomas Uppington, dec Turnham v Coates adjd sums
 In re Earnshaw, dec Cates v Earnshaw adjd sums
 In re Thursby's Settlement Grant v Littledale adjd sums
 In re Alexander Whitehead, dec Harrison v Whitehead adjd sums
 In re Ellen Russell Smith's Settlement In re Trustee Act, 1893 In re Public Trustee Act, 1906 adjd sums
 In re Baiss, dec Baiss v Hough adjd sums
 In re A A Spink, dec In re A A Freeman, dec Freeman v Freeman adjd sums
 Kettlewell v Kettlewell adjd sums
 In re S J Marchant, dec Weaver v The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals adjd sums
 In re Edmund Richards' Trusts Thomas v Westcott adjd sums
 Mellor v Dunn two adjd sums
 In re John McKie Elliott, dec Raven v Nicholson adjd sums
 In re Baxter, dec Malling v Addison adjd sums
 In re J. Stevenson, dec Malkin v Goostry adjd sums

Before Mr. Justice NEVILLE.
 Causes for Trial without Witnesses and Adjourned Summonses.
 O'Reilly v Bonney adjd sums (to come on with fur con)
 In re Shanaghan's Trusts Shanaghan v Shanaghan adjd sums
 In re Crabtree, dec Thomas v Crabtree adjd sums (s o)

Peters v Peters adjd summs (with witnesses)
In re Farnworth Grammar School Board of Education v Hughes adjd summs (s o)
In re Rodmell, dec Rodmell v Rodmell adjd summs (s o)
In re J P Robinson, dec Clarkson v Robinson adjd summs (to come on with fur con)
In re Jeffery Jeffery v Jeffery adjd summs (restored)
In re Bishop Bishop v Bishop adjd summs
In re Relph Rayner v Bateman adjd summs
In re Hall Hall v Marion adjd summs
In re Russell James v Bearcroft adjd summs
In re Hooley Lynch v Edmunds adjd summs
In re Boulds' Estate Metherell v Boulds adjd summs
In re Stilwell, dec In re Killinghurst Estate In re Settled Land Acts adjd summs
In re Dunbar's Trust Ward v Stuart adjd summs
In re Albert Tanner, dec Tanner v Roberts adjd summs
In re D. B. Scruton's Settled Estates In re Settled Land Acts adjd summs
In re Hughes' Trusts Lewis v James adjd summs
In re Love, dec Love v Love adjd summs
In re Ann Sparkes, dec Kemp-Welch v Kemp-Welch adjd summs
In re Dyson, dec Challinor v Sykes adjd summs
In re Steel's Will Trusts Bentley v Prince adjd summs
In re John Harris, dec Harris v Harris adjd summs
In re Paramatta Copper Mines Id O'Ryan v The Company adjd summs
In re Nassau's Estate Rigby v Harper adjd summs
In re J G Crace, dec Crace v Dolling adjd summs
In re Inault's Settlement Bracken v Packwood adjd summs
In re Hood and In re The West Ham Corp'n Act, 1902 adjd summs
Ironmongers' Co v Roberts adjd summs
In re Carpenter, dec In re Elizabeth Carpenter, dec Rees v Thomas adjd summs
In re Peters, dec Blinkhorn v Shapeott adjd summs
In re Lauder, dec Cathcart v Young adjd summs
In re H Crabtree Thomas v Crabtree adjd summs (with witnesses)
In re Hurford's Marriage Settlement Trusts Nance v Hurford adjd summs
In re Jefferson's Settled Estates In re Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890 adjd summs
In re Ogilvie's Charities Harvey v Attorney-Gen adjd summs
In re Cartnell and another's Contract with Richards In re Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874 adjd summs
In re J S Bird dec In re The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, 1891 University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire v University of Wales adjd summs
Attorney-Gen v Gray's Chalk Quarries Co m f j

In re Sir T. Dyer's Trusts Stileman v Dyer adjd summs
In re Jenkins, dec Jenkins v Jendwine adjd summs
In re John Feaver, dec Feaver v Feaver adjd summs
In re Stanley's Trust Deed Stanley v Attorney-Gen adjd summs
In re The Application, No 311,349 or Leopold Cassella and Co., and In re Trade Marks Act, 1905 mot
In re Kimmond, dec Field v Kimmond adjd summs
In re C H Gray, dec Gray v Gray adjd summs
In re Llanover Herbert v Ram adjd summs
In re Same Same v Same adjd summs
In re Hargrave, dec Hackney v Gale adjd summs
In re Foss, dec Foss v Foss adjd summs
In re Green v Howell adjd summs Further Considerations.
In re A E Rowney, dec Sinclair v Jermyn fur con
In re Jane Marner, dec Thomson v Marner fur con

Before Mr. Justice PARKER.
 Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
Mendelssohn v Traies and Son act (s o pending settlement)
The British Thomson Houston Co Id v Midland Ry Co act (s o Easter)
Carment v The Patriotic Investment Corp'n Id and ors act (s o not before Easter)
Jones v Rees act (s o generally)
Vogt v Morse act (s o Easter)
In re the Patents and Design Act, 1907, and In the Matter of Application of James Gray of Letters Patent, Nos. 7,188 of 1902, and 13,556 of 1902 petition (s o generally)
Ker Seymour v Bennett Stanford act (s o Trinity)
In re Amherst, dec Fountaine v Cecil act (s o generally)
Healey v Gower act (s o generally)
Warren v Baring Bros and Co Id act (s o generally)
In re Stainsley, dec Bentley and ors v Whitfield act (s o Easter)
Adhesive Dry Mounting Co Id v L Trapp and Co act
Woodger v Hamilton act (Newcastle-on-Tyne District Registry) (s o generally)
Demsey v Stephen Jobbins Id act
Lawler v Talmadge and anr act
Henry Gammon v Peter Mumford and Sons act
Brinton v Homfray act
Isdell v Macarthy act
Kettle v Wright act
The Stourcliffe Estate Co Id v The Mayor, etc. of Bournemouth act
Cooling v Palm act
Wetherley and Sons v The International Horse Agency and Exchange Id act
John Thomas Adams (trading as John Adams) v Thomas Adams act
In re Catford Building Supply Assoc Id Messers v Catford Building Supply Assoc act
Robinson v Smith act
London and Provincial Bank v Rowlands act
Leslie v Thompson act
Hird v Ruskin College act
Marlow v Forbes act

Templeton and Cox v Appleyard act Same v Same act (consolidated) (transferred from K.B. Division, by order)
The L A Thompson Mountain Scenic Railway of Shepherd's Bush Id v Kiralfy and ors act
T Sugden Id v Ferguson act and counter-claim
Babcock and Wilcox Id v The Water Tube Boiler and Engineering Co and ors act and counter-claim
Hudson v Stephenson act
In re Scott, dec Scott v Scott act
Bourne and anr v Solomans and Co act
In re The Trade Marks Act, 1905, and in the Matter of an Application, No. 309,084, by the Gramophone Co Id act (not before March 1)
Powell v Spencer act
Moger v Miles act
Bowles v Abbott act
Spelman v Pharaoh act
Manbridge v Butler act
Webb v Webb act and m f j
Bawden v Bawden act
In the Matter of Letters Patent, No. 28,807 of 1904, and In the Matter of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907 petition with witnesses
Clarke v Southan act
Brailey v Rhodesia Consolidated Id (in liquidation) and Walter Winder act
Iles v Besses o' th' Barn Old Band Union Id act
Curzon v Leigh act
Rueter v Bradford Advance Co act
Johnson and ors v Grice and anr act
The Hopton Wood Stone Firms Id v J J Gething and anr act
Friedberger v Davies act
Hudson v Spencer act
Welsh v White act
Smith v Smith act
Phillips v Morford act Morford v Phillips by counter-claim
Hunt, Roope, Teage and Co v Ehrmann Bros act
Butler v Rice and ors act
Cooke v Rigby act
Evans v Rees and anr act
Crawshaw v Howell act and counter-claim
Mills and ors v Bourne act
Barnett v The Mayor, Aldermen, etc. of the Borough of Woolwich act
Burdett-Coutts v Ridge Parish Council act
Young and anr v Toplis and Harding and ors act

Before Mr. Justice EVE.
 Retained by Order.
 Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
Saunders v Carbonneau act and counter-claim
In re H R G Toler, dec Toler v Rebou act
Hudson v Brixton Skating Rink Id act without pleadings
Merrick v Liverpool Corp'n act (Liverpool District Registry)
 Causes for Trial without Witnesses and Adjourned Summonses.
In re A E Collins' Trusts Collins v Trevail adjd summs
In re William Webb, dec Hart v Webb adjd summs
In re an Indenture of Settlement In re H Entwistle's Trust Loyd v Swinburne adjd summs

In re Swinburne's Settlement Swinburne v Loyd adjd summs
Miller v Miller act
In re Moses' Estate Cohen v Moses adjd summs
In re Sinclair, dec Lawson v Sinclair adjd summs
In re Taylor, dec Taylor v Taylor adjd summs
In re Emile Gutmann dec Ghideth v Morley adjd summs
Teale v Teale act without pleadings
In re Jessop, a Solr, etc adjd summs
In re Burr, dec Nelson v Burr adjd summs
In re Broome, dec Watmough v Knott adjd summs
In re Bealby, dec Hubbard v Rickatson adjd summs
In re Alfred Caton, dec Caton v Valcher adjd summs
In re The Bond Street Property Investment Co Cottrell v The Company adjd summs
In re Butters Butters v Rayment adjd summs
In re Tweedie, dec Bishop v The Atlas Assee Co adjd summs
In re The Rev J O'Sullivan, dec O'Sullivan v Lynch adjd summs
In re L W Campbell, dec Campbell v Campbell adjd summs
In re Colbeck, dec Hall v Colbeck adjd summs
In re J. Grierson, dec In re M E Grierson, dec Clarke v Grierson adjd summs
In re Bradley Greaves v Watkin adjd summs
In re H C Johnson, dec Johnson v Ladell adjd summs
In re Comfort, dec Fuller v Bray adjd summs
In re E N Dennys, dec Aumonier v Attorney-Gen adjd summs
Monckton v Gramophone Co adjd summs
In re Morris' Estate Johns v Mayer adjd summs
Balston v Bayer adjd summs
In re Fish, dec In re F J Fish, dec Fish v Light adjd summs
In re Jackson, dec Toon v Jackson adjd summs
In re Thornton's Settlement McLeod v Thornton adjd summs
In re Campell, dec Reading v Hindce adjd summs
In re Mayor and Corp'n of London Mayor and Corp'n of London v Great Western and Metropolitan Rys adjd summs
In re Maitland Dawes v Pickethall adjd summs
In re Poore's Charity Charity Commrs v Munday adjd summs
In re Price, dec Price v Price adjd summs
In re E S Claremont and In re the Trustee Act, 1893 adjd summs
In re H C Trevanion's Trusts Trevanion v Lennox adjd summs
In re Unite, dec Edwards v Harrison adjd summs
In re O Odams' Estate Vokins v Vokins adjd summs
In re Whitehouse, dec Brooks v Cockayne adjd summs
In re Besch Besch v Besch adjd summs
In re Campbell, dec Burkinyoung v Seton adjd summs
In re Burnham, dec Burnham v Scriven adjd summs
In re Burnham, dec Wright v Burnham adjd summs

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 4.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

- BRITISH SUBMARINE BOAT CO., LTD.**—Ptn for winding up, presented March 2, directed to be heard on March 15. Hammond & Richards, Lincoln's inn fields, solors for ptnr. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of March 14.
- EMPIRE ROLLER RINK CO., LTD.**—Ptn for winding up, presented Feb 26, directed to be heard on March 14. Clarke & Whittington, Leeds, solors for ptnr; London agents, Smiles & Co, Bedford row. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of March 13.
- EVES BROTHERS (APPLETON), LTD.**—Creditors are required, on or before April 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alan Standing, 41, North John st, Liverpool. Banks & Co, Liverpool, solors to liquidator.
- R. EMMSON & CO., LTD.**—Ptn for winding up, presented March 1, directed to be heard before Neville, J., on March 16. Jarvis, Finsbury sq, solor for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of March 14.
- "ROLITIES," LTD.**—Ptn for winding up, presented March 1, directed to be heard at the Court House, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool, March 18, at 10. Taylor, Liverpool, solor for ptnr. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of March 17.
- SAMSON LEATHER TREADS AND TYRE CO., LTD (GURNEY)**—Ptn for winding up, presented Feb 23, directed to be heard March 16. Crossley & Burn, Moorgate st bldg, solors for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of March 14.
- TANAN SYNDICATE, LTD (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)**—Creditors are required, on or before March 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to George Thomson, liquidator.
- UNITED FARMERS' INSURANCE CO., LTD.**—Ptn for winding up, presented Feb 8, directed to be heard before the court at Albion pl, Leeds, March 14, at 10.30. Peckover & Scriven, Leeds, solors for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of March 12.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 8.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

- J. STENBURY & CO., LTD (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)**—Creditors are required, on or before April 4, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Alfred Lavan, 26, Shaftesbury av, liquidator.
- SCHOENET PATENT COMPOSITION, LTD (IN LIQUIDATION)**—Creditors are required, on or before April 9, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Tyson, 160, Lendenhall st. Downing & Co, Crosby bldgs, Crosby sq, solors to the liquidator.
- SEILMERDALE HOUSE, LTD (IN LIQUIDATION)**—Creditors are required, on or before March 13, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Ernest Alfred Baker, Limes rd, Folkestone. Hall, Folkestone, solor to the liquidator.
- USION MILL CO., LTD.**—Ptn for winding up, presented March 4, directed to be heard at Manchester, on March 18, at 10. Rylands & Sons, Manchester, solors for the ptnr. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of March 17.
- WILLIAM BAKER (HUDSON MILLS), LTD.**—Creditors are required, on or before April 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Crosswallor Crosswallor, St George's church, Hebdon Bridge. Longthorpe & Sons, Hebdon Bridge, solors for the liquidator.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 4.

ENGLISH-RUSSIAN AGENCY, LTD.
TANAN SYNDICATE, LTD.
SOUTHPORT SKATING RINK CO., LTD.
KINGSWAY EXCHANGE, LTD.
RICHARD DEAN, SON & CO., LTD.
NEW ERA ASSURANCE CORPORATION, LTD.
ELECTRIC IGNITION CO., LTD.
HARRINGTON CLUB CO., LTD.
SHERATON SYNDICATE, LTD.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 8.

KOLCAN UBAL SYNDICATE, LTD.
BLACKPOOL COLOSSUM SKATING RINK CO., LTD.
ABERDEEN SKATING RINK CO., LTD.
COPPER-COLORS COPPER CORPORATION, LTD.
TURNER'S AUTOMOBILE WORKS, LTD.
TOW LAW SLAG CO., LTD.
LION ENGRAVING CO. (BLACKLEY), LTD.
H. VICTOR & CO., LTD.
PIPE LINE SYNDICATE, LTD.
SA TASH, THREE TOWNS AND DISTRICT STEAMBOAT CO., LTD.
J. STENBURY & CO., LTD.
"K.T." SYNDICATE, LTD.
MIDLAND MOTOR WHEEL CO., LTD.
NORTHERN VULCANISING AND RUBBER CO., LTD.
BOWEN GOLD MINING CO., LTD.
JAMES LITCHFIELD, LTD.
AJAX SANITARY CO., LTD.
CATRIS, LTD.
GWANDA RAILWAY SYNDICATE, LTD.

The Property Mart.

Forthcoming Auction Sales.

- Mar. 14.—Mr. F. W. BALCH, at the Mart, at 2: Houses and Freehold Properties (see advertisement, back page, Mar. 5).
- Mar. 16.—Messrs. DOUGLAS YOUNG & Co., at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Ground-rents (see advertisement, page v., Feb. 26).

Mar. 16.—Messrs. TROLLOPE, at the Mart, at 2: Short Leasehold Investments (see advertisement, back page, this week).

Mar. 16.—Messrs. FRANK JOLLY & JAMES, at the Mart, at 2: Block of Shop Property (see advertisement, back page, this week).

Mar. 17.—Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRAWFELD, at the Mart, at 2: Absolute Reversions, Legacy, Life Policy, &c. (see advertisement, back page, this week).

Mar. 17.—Messrs. LEOPOLD FARMER & SONS, at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Manufacturing Premises (see advertisement, back page, this week).

Mar. 22.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, RICHARDSON & Co., at the Mart, at 2: City Freehold Property (see advertisement, back page, Feb. 10).

Mar. 23.—Messrs. NICHOLAS at the Mart: Freehold Ground-rents, also Freehold Ground-rents for immediate sale by private treaty (see advertisement, back page, Mar. 5).

Creditors' Notices.

Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 1.

- CHANEY, WILLIAM, Lenham, Kent, Farmer March 21 Troutbeck v Cutbush and Palmer, Joyce and Eve, JJ. Norwood, Charing, nr Ashford.
- EVANS, HENRY BYAN, Blockley, Worcester, Pianoforte Manufacturer April 5 Metropolitan Bank of England and Wales (Limited) v Evans, Swinton Eady and Neville, JJ. Barker, Moreton in Marsh, Gloucester.
- GIDUMAL, JETHMAL, Holland Park mans, Indian Art Ware Merchant May 6 Gidumal v Jorck, Parker, J. Carr & Co, Road in.
- HARKER, HENRY, Upper Thames st, Drysalter April 5 Kilby v Galloway, Neville, J. Horne, Lincoln's inn fields.
- LEIGH, NORMAN, Norfolk st, Strand, Solicitor April 1 Humber v Naish, Parker, J. Chapman, Bedford row.
- WILLIS, THOMAS PRICE, Winslow, Buckingham, Solicitor April 5 Pain v Willis, Eve, J. Willis, Leighton Buzzard.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 4.

- JOHNSON, HARRY, Cornwall av, Wood Green, Builder March 30 Charles v Johnson, Parker, J. Sawbridge & Son, Aldersbury.
- SMITH, ELEANOR MARIA, Tunbridge Wells April 14 Brooks v Smith, Neville, J. Cripps, Tunbridge Wells.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Feb. 25.

- ABBEY, HENRY, Scarborough March 31 Pearson & Russell, Malton, Yorks.
- ALDERSON, HORATIO, Forest Gate March 30 Spencer & Co, Queen st.
- ARMSTRONG, WILLIAM, Bury St Edmunds March 16 Partridge & Wilson, Bury St Edmunds.
- ASHWORTH, ELIZA, Accrington March 28 Sprake, Accrington.
- ATHERTON, FANNY COMPTON, Clifton, Bristol March 29 Veale & Willway, Bristol.
- BIGGILL, HENRY, Lampton, Farmer Mar 19 Ruston & Co, Brentford.
- BLACKMORE, JOHN, Bere Ferrers, Devon, Farmer April 11 Watts & Co, Plymouth.
- BLYTE, MARY ANN, Gt Yarmouth March 31 Lynde, Gt Yarmouth.
- BRADICK, ELIZA, Llanblethian, Glam April 1 Miles, Cowbridge, Glam.
- COOMBS, RICHARD, Paignton, Devon, Merchant March 31 Smith & Kenny, Paignton.
- CORFIELD, LETTICIA, Albrighton, nr Wolverhampton March 31 Cooper, Bridgnorth.
- COX, MARY, Acklam, nr Middlesbrough March 28 Preston, Middlesbrough.
- CROOK, LE COL CHARLES KEVIN, Pall Mall April 4 Wilson & Co, Preston.
- DAVIES, WILLIAM, Rhyl, Flint April 5 Pierce Lewis, Rhyl.
- DENTON, SARAH JANE, Gloucester March 25 Grimes & Barry-Lewis, Gloucester.
- DONKIN, CHARLES, Sunderland March 11 Wallace, Sunderland.
- EDWARDS, EMILY NELSON, St Leonard's on Sea April 6 Tatham & Co, Manchester.
- FAIR, HELEN, Farnhead, Warrington March 31 Longland, Warrington.
- FINLAY, PETER, Norton, Yorks, Race Horse Jockey March 31 Pearson & Russell, Malton, Yorks.
- FLEWCHER, MARY ANN, Loughborough April 2 Bartlett & Co, Loughborough.
- FAY, JOHN GEORGE, Midsomer Norton, Somerset, Blacksmith March 31 Pearson, Bristol.
- HANDS, SARAH ANN, Staverton, Northampton April 6 W F & W Willoughby, Daventry.
- HARRISON, FRANK, Altrincham, Beerhouse Keeper April 11 Nicholls & Co, Altrincham.
- HEAP, EMMA, Tavistock sq March 23 Hilder & Co, Jermyn st, St James's.
- HOWER, FRANCIS, Stilton, Huntingdon, Wheelwright March 29 Sturton, Peterborough.
- HUNT, RICHARD, Leicester, Hosiery Manufacturer Mar 24 Whetstone & Frost, Leicester.
- JONES, JOHN, Abercarn, Mon Mar 23 Morgan & Co, Newport, Mon.
- KING, FREDERICK AUGUSTUS, Great Bardfield, Essex, Farmer Mar 25 Cunningham & Co, Braintree.
- KNAFF, GEORGE, Swanley, Kent, Fruit Grower April 2 Chandeilor & Ridley, Dartford.
- LAKE, FREDERICK, Reading April 9 Smith & Co, Ashby de la Zouch.
- LUCKETT, ESTHER, Chalk hill, Bushey, Herts Mar 24 Camp & Co, Watford.
- MACKRELL, JOHN, Clapham Common Mar 31 Macrell & Co, Cannon st.
- MILES, DAVID, Eastbourne, Carman April 16 Stapley, Eastbourne.
- PETTY, ALFRED MARTIN, Old Trafford, nr Manchester, Printer April 30 Diggle & Ogden, Manchester.
- PHILLIPS, MARY FAULKNER, Woburn Sands, Bucks Mar 31 Page & Thompson, Bristol.
- PORTER, MARY, Surbiton April 11 Barnard & Taylor, Lincoln's inn fields.
- RAINFLEY, WILLIAM, Chickorell, Dorset Mar 18 Lock & Co, Dorchester.
- REDDING, ALFRED, Lymington, Southampton, Butcher Mar 21 Heppenstall & Clark, Lymington.
- ROBINSON, REuben JAMES, Ashbourne, Derby April 11 Sale & Co, Manchester.
- SANDHAM, ROBERT, West Hartlepool March 23 Bell, West Hartlepool.
- SAVILL, Dr THOMAS DIXON, Harley st March 25 Elkin & Henriques, Salter's Hall et, Cannon st.
- SEAR, GEORGE HARRY, Littlehampton March 25 Busby, Queen Victoria st.
- SENIOR, EMILY, Northwich, Chester March 31 Dixon & Son, Northwich, Cheshire.
- SHARPLES, ISAAC, Blackburn, Insurance Superintendent March 31 Cooper & Son, Blackburn.
- TURNER, WALTON, Caterham, Surrey, Leather Factor April 11 Robinson & Co, Eastcheap.
- WALLACH, JULIUS, West End in, Hampstead, Merchant April 11 Robinson & Co, Eastcheap.
- WEBSTER, JAMES HENRY, Weston st, Bermondsey, Rope Manufacturer March 23 Kingdon & Co, Lawrence in, Cheapside.
- WHELDON, JOHN, Shuttlewood, Derby, Miner March 19 Allen & Anderson, Nottingham.
- WHITTAKER, HENRY JACKSON, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Solicitor March 25 Whiteside, Gt Crosby.
- WHYTEHEAD, THOMAS BOWMAN, Acomb, York March 25 Smithson & Teasdale, York.
- WISE, GEORGE, Camberwell March 23 Wansey & Co, Moorgate st.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 1.

ANSTREY, HARRY BERTRAM, Edgbaston, Birmingham April 4 Frost, Birmingham
 ASHWORTH, JAMES, Ramsbottom, Lancs, Cotton Manufacturer Mar 31 Butcher & Barlow, Bury
 AXCELL, CHARLES HENRY, Leigh on Sea, Essex, Corn Merchant Mar 17 Jefferies & Bygott, Southend on Sea
 BLOWERS, LOUISA MATTHEWS, Reading Mar 19 Brain & Brain, Reading
 BOWDEN, ELIZABETH, Stoke Damerel, Devonport Mar 30 Cornish-Bowden, Newton Abbot
 BROWN, GEORGE, Stanbury, nr Haworth, Yorks April 4 Butterfield, Keighley
 BURNETT, RICHARD ARNOLD, York rd, Lambeth, Lodging House Keeper Mar 15 Barnes, West st, Finsbury circus
 DOUGHERTY, JOHN HENWOOD, Huddersfield, Jeweller Mar 31 Owen & Bailey, Huddersfield
 FITZGERALD, BELINDA MARY, Oxford Mar 31 Ellis & Co, Raymond bldgs Gray's inn
 GRAHAIR, JOHN, Barton Moss, Patricroft Mar 25 Barrow & Smith, Manchester
 GURST, JOHN HENRY, West Hartlepool Mar 29 Woodhead, Bridlington
 HACKING, EVA MAGDALENA BARRETT, Old Trafford, Stretford, nr Manchester Mar 25 Barrow & Smith, Manchester
 HALLIWELL, JOHN, Leigh, Lancs, Publican March 30 Dootson, Leigh, Lancs
 HARDY, JOHN HENRY, Brixton hill, Commercial Traveller March 25 Taylor & Dorte, Blithers st
 HUGHES, JOHN, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler April 7 Weightman & Co, Liverpool
 HUNT, CHARLES, High Beech, Loughton, Essex, Shoemaker April 30 Robbins & Co, Strand
 HURST, WILLIAM, Tyldesley, Lancs, Farmer March 20 Dootson, Leigh, Lancs
 JAGGARD, WILLIAM THOROLD, Stoke Ferry, Norfolk, Tailor March 28 Mellor, Downham Market
 KEEL, JAMES, Ubley, Somerset March 31 Laxton, Bristol
 KINDERMAN, LOUIS, Liverpool, Tailor March 26 Marshall, Manchester
 LAUNDER, LYDIA LOUISA, Gowan av, Fulham March 31 Senior & Furbank, Richmond
 LAWTON, SARAH ELLEN CULCHETH, Lancs March 20 Dootson, Leigh, Lancs
 LEAFMAN, MOSS, Burma rd, Green Lancs April 9 Rowe & Wilkie, Basinghall st
 LITTEGORE, JAMES, Great Fold, Bedford, Lancs March 20 Dootson, Leigh, Lancs
 LYTTON, PETER, Great Fold, Bedford, Lancs, Yeoman March 20 Dootson, Leigh, Lancs
 McCALLUM, ANNIE, Southport April 30 Mayhew & Co, Southport
 McMECHAN, MAUD ALICE, Kersall, nr Manchester April 2 Dixon & Co, Manchester
 MAUDSLER, WILLIAM, North Shields, Leather Merchant April 1 Denison & Slater, Newcastle upon Tyne
 MEYER, JULIA CLARA, Freeland rd, Ealing Mar 15 Smith & Co, Sheffield
 MITCHELL, ELIZABETH MATILDA, Queen Ann rd, South Hackney April 1 Arkoll & Co, Toley st
 MOORE, WILLIAM GEORGE, Poole, Dorset Mar 24 Dickinson & Co, Poole, Dorset
 MULCASTER, MAJOR GENERAL WILLIAM SIDNEY SMITH, St Leonards on Sea, Sussex April 8 Morris & Spicer, St Leonards on Sea
 POTT, HENRY, Cornwall gdns, South Kensington April 2 Kirby & Co, The Sanctuary
 ROBERTS, THOMAS, Garston, Liverpool Mar 11 Sefton, Liverpool
 ROGERS, RICHARD ISAC, Deal Mar 28 W J & E H Tremellen, Southampton bldgs, Chancery ln
 ROLLANS, SARAH ANN, Coventry April 1 Band & Co, Coventry
 SHERWOOD, ELIZABETH, Brompton, nr Northallerton, Yorks Mar 5 Stevenson & Co, Darlington
 SHILLITO, ALICE, Birkdale, nr Southport May 31 Clayton & Co, Ashton under Lyne
 SIMMONS, HENRY ADOLPHUS, Basingstoke April 16 H & C Collins, Reading
 STEVENS, BASIL POWELL, Carlos pl, Grosvenor sq April 9 Wigan & Co, Victoria Embankment
 THIRTELL, EDWARD, Long Sutton, Lincs, Farmer March 31 Mossop & Mossop, Long Sutton, Lincs
 VIVIAN, ALICE, Herne Bay March 31 Indermarth & Brown, Chancery in
 WANLESS, GEORGE, Sunderland April 1 Rutson & Hope, Sunderland
 WHITLOCK, ALFRED ALLEN, Putney, Electrical Engineer March 31 Beaumont & Co, Chancery ln
 WOOL, THOMAS, Bishopston, Bristol, Hot Water Engineer March 24 Tarr & Sons, Bristol
 WRIGHT, JOHN, MARTHA GARDNER, and SARAH WRIGHT, Cleveleys, Lancs March 31 Rawthorn & Co, Preston
 WYCHERLEY, THOMAS GEORGE, Whitechurch, Salop, Bank Actuary April 2 Etches, Whitechurch

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Mar. 4.

AGNEW, ALICE ANNE, Salford, Lancs April 15 Sale & Co, Manchester
 ARNOTT, WILLIAM THOMAS, Monmouth April 4 Phillips & Son, Aberdare
 BARTLETT, GEORGE, Christchurch, Hants, Farmer March 8 Luff & Raymond, Wimbore
 BEARDSLEY, ANNIE, Nottingham March 21 Masser & Co, Nottingham
 BENNETT, JOHN WILLIAM, White Horse st, Stepney April 1 Adams & Colville, Old Jewry
 BONTE, FREDERICK, West Kirby, Cheshire April 9 Woolcott & Co, West Kirby
 BROWNE, ETHEL MARGARET GARD, Bath April 5 Bircham & Co, Parliament st
 BURGESS, FRANCIS EDWIN ELLIS, Sidcup, Kent April 15 Gellatly & Son, Blithers st
 CHAMBERLAIN, HENRY INGLIS, Istow on the Wold, Glos April 12 Trinder & Co, Leadenhall st
 COLLIER, JOHN MATTHEW, Macclesfield, Draper April 5 Barclay & Co, Macclesfield
 DELTA, THOMAS, Regents Park April 4 Kingsford & Co, Essex st, Strand
 DIXON, CHARLES JOHN, Holcombe, Dawlish, Devon April 23 Tozer & Dell, Teignmouth
 EDWARDS, THOMAS COUSINS, Oldham, Motor Agent April 4 Knott, Oldham
 FORSTER, FANNY, Ramsgate April 4 Willson & Norman, Arundel st, Strand
 HAM, JAMES, Castle st East, Oxford st, Carpenter April 5 Norris & Norris, Bedford row
 HANCOCK, WILLIAM Highlever rd, North Kensington April 1 Welman & Sons, Westbourne grove, Bayswater
 HARDEN, WILLIAM THORNEY, Sutton, Macclesfield April 5 Barclay & Co, Macclesfield
 HARDY, JOHN, Lancaster April 16 Todd, Lancaster
 HARE, ELIZA ANN, Sheerness April 15 Finch & Finch, Chatham
 HARRISON, PETER, Loughlight, Manchester, Greengrocer April 2 Harvey & Co, Manchester
 HARRISON, SUSAN CHARLOTTE, Bitterne pk, Southampton April 6 Waller, Southampton
 HEYWOOD, HANNAH, Hyde, Chester Mar 31 Hibbert & Co, Hyde
 HUBBARD, GAUIS Bognor April 20 Bownton & Co, Chichester
 HUBBARD, GERTRUDE, MERCEUR, Washington, Columbia April 23 Burch & Co, Spring gdns
 JOHNS, CATHERINE, Brynawel, Colwinstone, nr Bridgend Mar 31 Hughes & Lewis, Bridgend
 LANGE, ALBERT, Bradford April 30 Wade & Co, Bradford
 LASHMAN, MARY, Bristol April 16 Baker & Co, Weston super Mare
 LEWIS, ELIZA, Redhill, Surrey May 9 Stone & Co, Bath
 LOADER, ALFRED EDGAR, Southsea, Hants April 11 Public Trustee, Clement's inn Strand
 MANUELLE, GEORGE SCHWEE, Walmer, Kent April 15 Hardman, Deal
 MILLWOOD, WILLIAM SAMUEL, Lissac grove April 3 E & J Mote, South sq, Gray's inn
 NEWTON, JOHN, Market Drayton March 31 Warren & Co, Market Drayton
 PARKER, MARIA, High Barnet April 11 Guscotte & Co, Essex st, Strand
 PECKETT, SAMUEL JOHNSON, Sheffield, Edge Tool Manager April 12 Fernell, Sheffield

PERKINS, CHARLOTTE, Leicester April 25 Salusbury & Woodhouse, Leicester
 PERRIN, JOHN, Stockton Heath, Yeoman April 9 Ridgway, Warrington
 PERRY, WILLIAM, Exmouth March 31 Hogan & Hughes, Arthur st West
 PORTER, CHARLES EDWARD, Blandford Forum, Dorset, Auctioneer April 1 Castlemann, Smith & Symes, Blandford Forum
 PRESCOTT, THOMAS, Ashton in Makerfield, Lancs March 14 Bridge, Wigan
 RAPHAEL, RICHARD HENRY, Throgmorton st, Banker April 11 Sydney, Finsbury pvt
 REDDY, WILLIAM, Ashton under Lyne March 21 Pownall, Ashton under Lyne
 RITTER, WALTER HENRY DE, East India Dock rd, Poplar April 5 Bradshaw & Water, Finsbury sq
 SAVAGE, MARY GARNER, Hampstead April 15 Lindus & Horton, Trump st, King at
 SCOTT, HENRY JOHN, Whitmore rd, Hackney, Coal Merchant April 1 Kays & Jones, Norfolk st
 SIMMONDS, ANNE, Chipping Norton, Oxford April 14 Wilkins & Toy, Chipping Norton
 SIMMONS, THOMAS, Watford April 5 Sedgwick & Co, Watford
 SMEDLEY, JOB, Blackpool March 31 Finch & Co, Blackpool
 SMITHURST, JOHN KINDER, Mossley, Chester, Mill Manager April 2 Lawton, Mossley
 SPURGIN, GEORGE, Sudbury, Suffolk April 1 Bates & Wells, Sudbury
 STONE, THOMAS, St Albans, Herts, Builder April 18 Beal, St Albans
 SWONNELL, GEORGE HENRY, Wandsworth Common April 4 Horsley & Weightman, Basinghall st
 TINDALL, ALFRED FREDERICK, Sunderland av, Maida Vale April 15 Broad & Co, Gt
 TOMLINSON, ANNIE, Paris April 14 Atkinson, Berkhill on Sea
 WEND, JESSE DE, Southport April 15 Cayley & Cayley, Southampton bldgs, Chancery in
 WILLIAMS, MARIA, Plymouth April 2 Shelly & Johns, Plymouth
 WINCKWORTH, WILLIAM DAWSON, Bath, Surgeon Dentist April 5 Payne & Co, Bath
 YARWOOD, MARTHA, Alderley Edge, Chester April 5 Barclay & Co, Macclesfield
 ZEPHEN, ALBERT HUGO ADOLPH, Upper Woburn pl April 18 Sewell & Co, Bucklersbury

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Mar. 8.

ADAMS, JULIA WILLIAMS, Queen st, Hammersmith April 30 Winter & Co, Bedford row
 AKERS, ELIZABETH, Wendover, Bucks March 31 Carruthers & Gedy, Liverpool
 ANTHOPUS, EDWARD, New Mills, Derby March 31 Walker, New Mills
 ARMSTRONG, JOHN WILLIAM, Tooting, Wheelwright March 19 Rubinstein & Co, Rayner bldgs, Gray's inn
 BAKER, ARTHUR, Charing Cross April 4 Crump & Son, Leadenhall st
 BARTLETT, RICHARD CROFTS, Marshwood, Dorset, Farmer April 9 Nantes & Munnell, Bldport
 BAKER, ROBERT, Bretherton, nr Preston, Farmer April 8 Ilawthorn & Co, Preston
 BAKER, ELLEN, Bretherton, nr Preston April 8 Rawthorn & Co, Preston
 BOOTH, MARTHA, Denton, Lancashire April 12 Richards, Denton
 BRADBURY, JORDAN, Heaton Moor, nr Stockport April 2 Read, Blackpool
 BRETON, ANNA MARIA, Norwood April 30 Roche & Co, Church st, Old Jewry
 BURY, JOHN, Wrexham, Land Agent April 11 Bury & Acton, Wrexham
 CLAVE-BROWNE, CHARLOTTE, Bedford April 16 Cooper, Barnet
 CLAYTON, WILLIAM, Southport April 2 Fieldhouse, Manchester
 COOPER, ELIZABETH, Champion hill, Denmark hill April 14 Thorogood & Co, Cophall ct
 COOPER, HENRY, Blackburn, Foreman Bricklayer March 19 William Cooper, 70, Poplar st, Blackburn
 COOPER, THOMAS, Oxford, Baker March 31 Langley, Oxford
 DUFF, SARAH, Nottingham March 25 Wing & Son, Nottingham
 DAIKE, THOMAS, Cheetham, Manchester, Horse Collar Maker April 20 Bullock & Co, Manchester
 DENNE, RALPH THOMAS, Lydd, Kent April 25 Freer & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 DIMBLEY, JAMES, Donington, Salop April 19 Garsed, Eiland
 DIXON, ANN, Haydon Bridge, Northumberland April 6 L C & H K Lockhart, Hexham
 DROOSTEN, REV PERCY HOWARD, MA, Bingham, Notts April 5 Eling & Co, Nottingham
 FALCKE, ISAAC, Gower st, Bedford sq April 5 Budd & Co, Austin Friars
 FROOK, THOMAS, Totnell, Leigh, Dorset April 2 Ffooks & Grimley
 GODDARD, AMOS, Lockwood, Huddersfield April 30 Hall & Co, Huddersfield
 GOODMAN, THOMAS, Brighton Jan 17 Cockburn & Son, Brighton
 GOODMAN, MARY, Brighton Jan 17 Cockburn & Son, Brighton
 HARRISON, GERTRUDE, Cromer, Fancy Goods Dealer April 9 Hansell & Hales, Cromer
 HOLMES, ROBERT JOHN, Smith, Yorks, Merchant April 16 E & T Clark, Smith
 IDDESLEY, THE RT HON CHLOEIA FRANCES Countess of, Charles st, Berkeley sq April 14 Farrer & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 JOHNSON, WILLIAM HENRY ST CLAIR, Sway, Hants April 12 Kingsford & Co, Essex st, Strand
 JONES, CHARLES JOSEPH, Liverpool April 8 Banks & Co, Liverpool
 KIRBY, WILLIAM, Wheeler End, Buckingham, Farmer April 9 Reynolds & Son, High Wycombe
 LANDSBERGER, GUSTAV, Old Broad st April 16 Smith & Co, London wall
 LATOUCHE, WILLIAM, Eccleshill, Bradford, Stuff Merchant April 19 H T & W Pullan, Bradford
 LEGGOTT, HENRY JAMES, Hornsey May 1 Robins & Clark, Hornsey
 MADDISON, MARY ANN, Hartlepool March 23 Bell, West Hartlepool
 MADDISON, NICHOLAS, Hartlepool, Colliery Fitter March 23 Bell, West Hartlepool
 MARSHALL, JOHN, Sydney, New South Wales, Carpenter April 16 Corbett, Darlaston
 MICHELL, LOUISA, Canford Cliff, Bournemouth April 16 Rawle & Co, Bedford row
 MORRISON, HARRIET, Ascot April 19 Budd & Co, Austin Friars
 MULLENDER, SARAH ANN, Gravesend April 5 Hatten & Co, Gravesend
 NEESHAM, ELEANOR, Leeds April 30 Wooler & Co, Leeds
 NEVISON, BASIL GEORGE, Tedworth sq, Chelsea, Barrister at Law April 15 Edwards & Co, Saville st, Piccadilly
 NUSSEY, THOMAS, Thorne, nr Leeds April 16 North & Sons, Leeds
 OLDHAM, MARTHA THOMPSON, Macclesfield April 9 Hand, Macclesfield
 PARK, CORNELIUS, JOHN, South Hayling, Southampton April 25 EG & J W Chester, Newington Butts
 PATERSON, GEORGE, Ealing April 30 Procter, Ealing
 PINKNEY, SARAH JEMIMA, Stockport April 7 Fern & Co, Stockport
 PUGGER, GEORGE HALE, Windermere, Westmorland April 9 Bowness, Windermere
 REKXSON, HANNAH REBECCA, Leeds April 11 Hewson & Goodall, Leeds
 RICHARDSON, SARAH EMMA, Leamington Spa, Warwick April 5 Passman, Leamington Spa
 RUSHFORTH, BENJAMIN, Ovenden, Halifax April 1 Boocock & Son, Halifax
 SAUNDON, JOHN, Amotherby, Tailor April 4 Ridge, Malton
 SCOTT, ARCHIBALD, Woodford Wells, Essex, Accountant April 5 Crump & Sons, Leadenhall st
 SOWERBY, JOHN, Cuxwold Hall, Lincoln, Farmer April 4 Mason, South Grimby
 SOUTHEY, MARY, Teignmouth April 7 Jordan & Son, Teignmouth
 SPEED, ROSALIE ERNESTINE HENRIETTE ADELE, Lower Sloane st April 25 Burch & Co, Spring gdns
 SPENCER, JOHN, Old Hill, Staffs, Horse Nail Maker March 18 Cooksey & Co, Old Bill
 THOMSEN, SOREN RINGHOLM, Kingston upon Hull April 8 Reed, Hull
 WATTS, GEORGE, West Kirby, Chester, African Merchant May 3 Tibbitts, Liverpool
 WEBB, THOMAS HAYES, Southport May 3 Tibbitts, Liverpool
 WILLIAMS, LAURA MAJOR, Grove End rd, St John's Wood March 31 Le Brasseur & Oakley, Carey st, Lincoln's inn

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 4.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALEXANDRA, WALTER, Fawcett st, Fulham, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 AYLESBURY, ARTHUR, Hulme, Manchester, Butcher Manchester Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 BELL, GEORGE ARTHUR, Shrewsbury Shrewsbury Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 BISHOP, WILLIAM, Woking, Surrey, Builder Guildford Pet Feb 10 Ord Mar 2
 BLACKWALL, GEORGE EDWARD, Wigmore st, Teacher of Singing High Court Pet Feb 9 Ord Mar 1
 BLUNT, OSWOLD DONALDSON, Clarendon st, Pimlico High Court Pet Jan 23 Ord Feb 28
 BRADLEY, WILLIAM JAMES, Cullum st, Solicitor High Court Pet Jan 7 Ord Mar 3
 BREAKAL, ISAAC, Greenwood rd, Dalston High Court Pet Nov 16 Ord Mar 1
 BRINDLEY, FANNY, Hightown, Manchester, Baker Manchester Pet Feb 5 Ord Mar 1
 BUTT, OSCIL, Olton, Warwick Birmingham Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 CARRSON, R. P., Leytonstone, Essex, Coal Merchant High Court Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 28
 CARTER, JAMES THOMAS, Gt Yarmouth, Fruiterer Gt Yarmouth Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 DARE, DENNIS, Northam, Devon, Dairyman Barnstaple Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 DAVIES, PHILIP REES, Shaftesbury av, Hosier High Court Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 28
 DOWNING, WILLIAM JOHN, Truro, Smith Truro Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 ENGLAND, ROBERT WILLIAM Gt Yarmouth, Coal Merchant Gt Yarmouth Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 FREEMAN, FREDERICK KOSUTH, Gloucester, Builder Gloucester Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 GODFREY, JOHN, Chesterfield, Colliery Bankman Chesterfield Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 GRIFFITHS, ROBERT, Cymmer, Porth, Glam, Collier Pontypridd Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 HEXT, THOMAS, Stocklinch, Somerset, Hay Dealer Yeovil Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 HIBBERT, FREDERICK GEORGE, Derby, Painter Derby Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 HORROCKS, FRANK, and JESSE HORROCKS, Leigh, Lancs, Bakers Bolton Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 JACKSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Sydenham High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 JENNISON, FRANCIS HERBERT, Upper Cheyney, nr Bilton, Glos, Analytical Chemists Bristol Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 MAGGS, THOMAS WILLIAM, Bristol, Fruiterer Bristol Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 MARTIN, THOMAS CYRIL HAGUE, Southwold, Suffolk, Boat Builder Gt Yarmouth Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 MORRELL, JOSEPH THOMAS, Southend on Sea, Clerk Chelmsford Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 MUNDAY, JOHN, Gravesend, Printer Rochester Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 PEGG, SAMUEL JOSEPH, Kegworth, Leicester, Baker Leicester Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 PERKINS, JOHN, Clydach Vale, Glam, Underground Haulier Pontypridd Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 POWER, JOSEPH FREDERICK, Walsall, Draper Walsall Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SANDERS, ERNEST, Sapcote, Leicester, Farmer Leicester Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 SEDGWICK, FREDERICK ARTHUR, Crossgates, Yorks, Confectioner Leeds Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SEED, WILLIAM, Lutton, nr Longridge, Lancs, Quarrymaster Preston Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 SEIFERT, FRITZ, Garies st, Forest Hill Printer Greenwich Pet Feb 4 Ord Mar 1
 SHEPHERD, WILLIAM JOHN, Ludgers Hall, Bucks, Licensed Victualler Oxford Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 SIMS, HENRY, Warminster, Wilts, Boot Seller Frome Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SINGLETON, REUBEN, Salford, Birmingham Birmingham Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SNELL, HARRY ALFRED, Canterbury, Plumber Canterbury Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 STEEL, EDGAR, Brighton, Accountant Brighton Pet Feb 16 Ord Mar 2
 STRONGELL, HAROLD F H, Chatham Rochester Pet Feb 2 Ord Feb 28
 SWEET, WILLIAM HENRY, Frittlevell, Essex, Bootmaker Chelmsford Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 WESTWOOD, JOHN, Swanssea, Grocer Swanssea Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 WHETTER, WILLIAM, jun, Redruth, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 WINDER, WILLIAM AMBROSE, Bradford Bradford Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 28
 YEADON, JOHN, Otley, Yorks, House Furnisher Leeds Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Mar 1:

YAM, JACOB, Leeds, Fish Hawker Leeds Pet Feb 24 Ord Feb 24

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALEXANDRA, WALTER, Fawcett st, Fulham, Licensed Victualler Mar 15 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 ALLEN, RUPERT SYDNEY, Souththorpe, Lincs, Watchmaker Mar 12 at 11 Off Rec, St Mary's chmbrs, Great Grimsby
 BAGSHAW, JOSEPH, Higher Broughton, Salford, Lancs Mar 14 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 BARLOW, THOMAS HENRY ALLEN, Morecambe, Building Contractor Mar 12 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Winckley st, Preston

BLACKWALL, GEORGE EDWARD, Wigmore st, Teacher of Singing Mar 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 BLUNT, OSWOLD DONALDSON, Clarendon st, Pimlico Mar 15 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 BRADLEY, WILLIAM JAMES, Cullum st, Solicitor Mar 14 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 BREAKAL, ISAAC, Greenwood rd, Dalston Mar 18 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 BROWN, GEORGE, Tamworth, Clothier Mar 15 at 12 Ruskin chmbrs, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 CAMERON, R. P., Leytonstone, Essex, Coal Merchant Mar 15 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 CLEVES, JOSHUA GAROGAY, Leicester, Hosiery Factor Mar 14 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 COWLEY, ARTHUR, Palace rd, Streatham, Merchant Mar 14 at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 DAVIES, EDWARD, Merthyr Tydfil, Colliery Rider Mar 14 at 12 Off Rec, County Court, Townhall, Merthyr Tydfil
 DAVIES, PHILIP REES, Shaftesbury av, Hosier Mar 15 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 DAVIES, THOMAS, Landsevy, Landsevy Velfrey, Pembroke, Grocer Mar 12 at 12.45 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
 EDWARDS, ARTHUR, Kingston, Hereford Mar 15 at 10.30 Townhall, Leominster
 EVANS, EDWARD, Oswestry, Salop, Grocer Mar 16 at 12.30 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
 EVANS, JAMES YOUNG, Treorchy, Glam, Draper Mar 16 at 11.30 Off Rec, Post Office chmbrs, Taff st, Pontypridd
 FREE, ROBERT STANLEY, Clacton on Sea Mar 18 at 12 Cups Hotel, Colchester
 GAUNLETT, HARRY, Liphook, Hants, Builder Mar 14 at 2.30 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth
 GRIFFITHS, ROBERT, Forth, Glam, Collier Mar 17 at 11.15 Off Rec, Post Office chmbrs, Taff st, Pontypridd
 HARRIS-BICKFORD, JOHN SOLOMON BICKFORD, Falmouth, Tailor Mar 16 at 11.30 Off Rec, 12, Princes st, Truro
 HENDERSON, EDWARD, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough, Clerk Mar 17 at 11.30 Off Rec, Court chmbrs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 HESLOP, ROBERT PARKINSON, Stockton on Tees, Cab Proprietor Mar 15 at 11.30 Off Rec, Court chmbrs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 JENKINSON, WALTER SYDNEY, Rodborough, nr Stroud, Glos, Electrical Engineer Mar 12 at 12 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester
 JOHNSON, ERNEST JOSEPH, Hartshill, Warwick, Painter Mar 14 at 11.30 Off Rec, 8, High st, Coventry
 JONES, ROBERT, Holway, Holywell, Flint, Coal Miner Mar 16 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
 JACKSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Sydenham Mar 14 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 JONES, DAVID, Pontlottyn, Glam, Grocer Mar 18 at 11.30 Off Rec, Post Office chmbrs, Taff st, Pontypridd
 MUNDAY, JOHN, Gravesend, Printer Mar 21 at 1.45 115, High st, Rochester
 NORRIS, STEPHEN, Middlesbrough, Contractor Mar 15 at 12 Off Rec, Court chmbrs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 PERKINS, JOHN, Clydach Vale, Glam, Underground Haulier Mar 17 at 11.45 Off Rec, Post Office chmbrs, Taff st, Pontypridd
 PORRINGTON, THOMAS ROBERT, Upton Cross, nr Liskeard, Cornwall, Licensed Victualler Mar 22 at 11 Off Rec, 7, Buckland ter, Plymouth
 POUNDER, WILLIAM HENRY, and ALBERT POUNDER, Clayton le Moor, Lancs, Cotton Manufacturers Mar 14 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Winckley st, Preston
 PHOLEAU, LOUIS ST JOHN, Wroxham, Norfolk Mar 16 at 2 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 RAMSDEN, HENRY, Bradford, Grocer Mar 14 at 11 Off Rec, 12, Duke st, Bradford
 RHODES, STEPHEN, Centre, Glam, Confectioner Mar 16 at 2 Off Rec, Post Office chmbrs, Taff st, Pontypridd
 ROBERTS, BALFIE HILL, 88, Rust in Fenwih, Cornwall, Builder Mar 16 at 12 Off Rec, 13, Princes st, Truro
 SEDGWICK, FREDERICK ARTHUR, Crossgates, Yorks, Confectioner Mar 15 at 11 Off Rec, 24, Bond st, Leeds
 SHINE, ARTHUR STANLEY, Liverpool, Decorator Mar 14 at 3 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 SIMONS, GEORGE, Bedford, Baker Mar 15 at 10.30 Shirehall, Bedford
 SMITH, ADRIE FLORENCE CATHOAST, Southsea, Hants Mar 14 at 4 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth
 STEVENSON, WILLIAM THOMAS, Plymouth, Builder Mar 16 at 3.30 Off Rec, 7, Buckland ter, Plymouth
 WESTWOOD, JOHN, Swanssea, Grocer Mar 15 at 11 Off Rec, Government bldgs, St Mary's st, Swanssea
 WINDRA, WILLIAM AMBROSE, Bradford Mar 14 at 12 Off Rec, 12, Duke st, Bradford
 YEAMER, JAMES, Bridlington, Yorks, Tailor Mar 14 at 4 Off Rec, 48, Westborough, Scarborough
 YEADON, JOHN, Otley, Yorks, House Furnisher Mar 15 at 11.30 Off Rec, 24, Bond st, Leeds

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Mar 1:

THOMAS, THOMAS ALBINUS, Painters in, Waltham Cross, Nurseryman Mar 10 at 12 14, Bedford row

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALEXANDRA, WALTER, Fawcett st, Fulham, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 AYLESBURY, ARTHUR, Hulme, Manchester, Butcher Manchester Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 BAGSHAW, JOSEPH, Higher Broughton, Salford, Lancs Salford Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 BLACK, DAVID, Fleet rd, Hampstead, Restaurant Proprietor High Court Pet Oct 30 Ord Feb 28
 BUTT, OSCIL, Olton, Warwick Birmingham Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 CARTER, JAMES THOMAS, Gt Yarmouth, Fruiterer Gt Yarmouth Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 DARE, DENNIS, Northam, Devon, Dairyman Barnstaple Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2

DAVIS, PHILIP REES, Shaftesbury av, Hosier High Court Pet Feb 10 Ord Mar 1
 DAY, JOHN, Smethwick, Staffs, Fish Dealer West Bromwich High Court Pet Feb 10 Ord Mar 2
 DOUGLAS, F GORDON, Hillsborough Barracks, Sheffield High Court Pet Nov 24 Ord Feb 28
 DOWNING, WILLIAM JOHN, Truro, Smith Truro Pet Feb 27 Ord Feb 28
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM HAROLD, Castellain mans, Maida Vale High Court Pet Feb 4 Ord Mar 1
 FREEMAN, FREDERICK KOSUTH, Gloucester, Builder Gloucester Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 GIBSON, ROBERT JAMES, Clarence gate guns, Baker at High Court Pet Jan 15 Ord Feb 28
 GODFREY, JOHN, Chesterfield, Colliery Bankman Chesterfield Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 GRIFFITHS, ROBERT, Cymmer, Porth, Glam, Collier Pontypridd Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 HEXT, THOMAS, Stocklinch, Somerset, Hay Dealer Yeovil Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 HIBBERT, FREDERICK GEORGE, Derby, Painter Derby Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 HICKMAN, G G, Claverley, Ashted, Surrey Croydon Pet Jan 29 Ord Mar 2
 HORROCKS, FRANK, and JESSE HORROCKS, Leigh, Lancs, Bakers Bolton Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 HUDSON, WILLIAM, Whitfield, Farnham, Glos, Farmer Bristol Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 JACKSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Kirkdale, Sydenham, Assistant Manager to a Newspaper High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 JONAS, JULIUS, Fenchurch st, Cigar Importer High Court Pet Jan 14 Ord Feb 28
 JONES, DAVID, Pontlottyn, Glam, Grocer Merthyr Tydfil Pet Feb 24 Ord Feb 28
 LANSER, WILLIAM GILBERT, Dulwich High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 LUSH, JOHN, Underriver, Seal, Kent, Farmer Tunbridge Wells Pet Feb 1 Ord Mar 2
 MAGGS, THOMAS WILLIAM, Bristol, Fruiterer Bristol Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 MOSLEY, FRANCES, Graham rd, Hackney High Court Pet Jan 31 Ord Mar 2
 MUNDAY, JOHN, Gravesend, Printer Rochester Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 PEGG, SAMUEL JOSEPH, Kegworth, Leicester, Baker Leicester Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 PERKINS, JOHN, Clydach Vale, Glam, Underground Haulier Pontypridd Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 POWER, JOSEPH FREDERICK, Walsall, Draper Walsall Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 RHOADS, STEPHEN, Fentle, Glam, Confectioner Pontypridd Pet Feb 28 Ord Mar 1
 SANDERS, ERNEST, Sapcote, Leicester, Farmer Leicester Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 SEDGWICK, FREDERICK ARTHUR, Crossgates, Yorks, Confectioner Leeds Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SHEPHERD, WILLIAM JOHN, Ludgershall, Bucks, Licensed Victualler Oxford Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 SIMS, HENRY, Warminster, Wilts, Bootseller Frome Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SINGLETON, REUBEN, Salford, Birmingham Birmingham Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SNELL, HARRY ALFRED, Canterbury, Plumber Canterbury Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 SWEET, WILLIAM HENRY, Frittlevell, Essex, Bootmaker Chelmsford Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 THOMAS, EDWARD, Foxfield, Hants, Artist Portsmouth Pet Jan 29 Ord Feb 28
 WESTWOOD, JOHN, St Thomas, Swanssea, Grocer Swanssea Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 WIDDICOMBE, JOHN, Berners st, Oxford st, Manufacturers' Agent High Court Pet Jan 28 Ord Mar 2
 WHETTER, WILLIAM, jun, Redruth, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28
 WINDER, WILLIAM AMBROSE, Bradford, Yarn Merchant's Salesman Bradford Pet Feb 12 Ord Mar 1
 YEADON, JOHN, Otley, Yorks, House Furnisher Leeds Pet Feb 28 Ord Feb 28

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Feb 18:

HABOOD, SAMUEL VERNON, Wimbledon, Photographer Kingston, Surrey Pet Jan 31 Ord Feb 14

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 8.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BELL, WILLIAM HENRY, Devonport, Devon, Licensed Victualler Plymouth Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 3
 BLACK, DAVID, and GEORGE BLACK, Redford, Notts, Plumbers Lincoln Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 CARR, WILLIAM HENRY, Doncaster, Milk Dealer Sheffield Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 CARTER, WILLIAM, Colaton Raleigh, Devon, Miller Exeter Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 COX, FREDERICK, Streatham High rd, Surrey, Schoolmaster Croydon Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 CROFT, FRANK HUBERT, Leatherhead, Builder Croydon Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 DARE, GEORGE, jun, and GEORGE MAW, Hinckley, Hosiery Manufacturers Leicester Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 DICKINSON, THOMAS DAVID, Bottom o' th' Moor, Oldham, Licensed Victualler Oldham Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 EDMUNDS, EDWARD WILLIAM, Rusdon, Denbigh, Civil Engineer Wrexham Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM HENRY, Ransgate, Iron Founder Canterbury Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 ELEAN, ROBERT ARTHUR, Dover Canterbury Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 EVANS, SEBASTIAN, Molash, nr Canterbury Canterbury Pet Feb 14 Ord Mar 5
 GRIFFITHS, FREDERICK, Tarporley, Painter Crewe Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 3
 GULLIVER, SAMUEL, Aylesbury, Wine Merchant Aylesbury Pet Feb 16 Ord Mar 3
 HAWKINS, THOMAS, Oldham, Grocer Oldham Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3

HILABOS DE TERRECO & Co, Bishopgate st Without, Merchants High Court Pet Feb 15 Ord Mar 4
 HUBST, STEPHEN, Chiswick, Builder Brentford Pet April 5 Pet Mar 4
 JEFFERIES, HENRY CHARLES, Gerrard's Cross, Bucks, Clothier Windsor Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 JOSEPH, ISAAC, New cut, Lambeth, Fruiterer High Court Pet Feb 15 Ord Mar 4
 KAY, WILLIE, Southdown, Halifax, Farm Bailiff Halifax Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 McCLELLAND, SAMUEL, Aldersgate st, Shipping Agent High Court Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 MARKS, HAY, Trelaw, Rhonda, Glam, Boot Factor Pontypriid Pet Feb 21 Ord Mar 4
 MASON, WILLIAM CHARLES, Portland pl, Clapham rd, Tin Plate Worker High Court Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 MASSEY, C W, & Co, Clacton on Sea, Wine Merchants Colchester Pet Feb 11 Ord Mar 4
 NORTHOVER, ERNEST JOHN, Swanage, Licensed Victualler Poole Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 OXLEY, JAMES, Denton, Barham, Kent, Glazier Canterbury Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 POTTS, JAMES, Halthwaite, Northumberland, Cycle Engineer Carlisle Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 PRITCHARD, CHARLES, Chiswick, Tailor Brentford Pet Feb 9 Ord Mar 4
 PYE, RICHARD, Hadley, nr Wellington, Milkseller Shrewsbury Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 READ, JOHN, Silsden, Yorks, Chipped Potato Dealer Bradford Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 REDMAN, THOMAS, Cardiff, Horse Dealer Cardiff Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 ROBERTS, EDWARD, Southport, Coach Builder Liverpool Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 ROBERTS, JOHN STEPHEN, Blaenau Ffestiniog, Merioneth, Quarryman Portmadoc Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 SCHWARTZ, MEILAH, Goodge st, Tottenham Court rd, Fancy Goods Dealer High Court Pet Feb 10 Ord Mar 3
 STRICKLETON, MARY ALICE, Bolton, Milliner Bolton Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 TACK, GEORGE, Walpole gdns, Gunnersbury High Court Pet Feb 4 Ord Mar 3
 TYZACK, JOHN WILLIAM, Leeds, Jeweller Leeds Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 WATERS, ELIZABETH, Mountain Ash, Glam, Tobaccoconist Aberdare Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 WILKINSON, ARABELLA THYZER, Folkestone, Lodging House Keeper Canterbury Pet Feb 24 Ord Mar 5

RECEIVING ORDER DISCHARGED.

HAWKINS, THOMAS ERNEST, and WILLIAM HENRY DALTON, Victoria st, Westminster, Contractors High Court Rec Ord Sept 9, 1909 Dis Rec Ord Mar 4, 1910

FIRST MEETINGS.

AYLESBURY, ARTHUR, Hulme, Manchester, Butcher Mar 16 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 BISHOP, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Woking, Builder Mar 18 at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 BRINDLEY, FANNY, Hightown, Manchester, Baker Mar 16 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 BUTT, OSCIL, Olton, Warwick Mar 18 at 12 Ruskin chmbrs, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 CALLOW, HERBERT JAMES, Ashford, Kent, Clerk Mar 16 at 10.15 Off Rec, 68A, Castle st, Canterbury
 COX, FREDERICK, Streatham, Schoolmaster Mar 18 at 12 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 CROPLEY, FRANCIS HUBERT, Leatherhead, Builder Mar 16 at 2.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 CURTIS, WALTER BOOTH, Wellingborough, Northampton, Plumber Mar 18 at 12 Off Rec, The Parade, Northampton
 DARE, GEORGE, jun, and GEORGE MAW, Hinckley, Leicester, Hosiery Manufacturers Mar 16 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 DAY, JOHN, Smethwick, Staffs, Fish Dealer Mar 18 at 11.30 Ruskin chmbrs, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 DICKINSON, THOMAS DAVID, Bottom o' th' Moor, Oldham, Licensed Victualler Mar 18 at 12 Off Rec, Greaves st, Oldham
 DOWNSING, WILLIAM JOHN, Tyuro, Smith Mar 17 at 12 Off Rec, Princes st, Tyuro
 ENGLAND, ROBERT WILLIAM, Gt Yarmouth, Coal Merchant Mar 16 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 EVERINGHAM, WYOLIFFE GALLAND, Ilford, Electrician Mar 16 at 12 14, Bedford row
 FREEMAN, FREDERICK KOSUTH, Gloucester, Builder Mar 19 at 12 Off Rec, Station rd Gloucester

GRIFFITHS, FREDERICK, Tarporley, Chester, Painter Mar 18 at 10.30 Petty Sessional Court House, Edleston rd, Crewe
 HAWKINS, THOMAS, Oldham, Grocer Mar 18 at 11.30 Off Rec, Greaves st, Oldham
 HEXT, THOMAS, Stockinch, Somerset, Hay Dealer Mar 17 at 1 Off Rec, City chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury
 HIBBERT, FREDERICK GEORGE, Derby, Painter Mar 16 at 1 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby
 HILABOS DE TERRECO & Co, Bishopgate st Without, Merchants Mar 17 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HODDER, FRANCIS JOHN, Redland, Bristol Mar 23 at 12 Off Rec, Wolverhampton
 HOBBOCKS, FRANK and JESSE HOBBOCKS, Leigh, Lancs, Bakers Mar 17 at 3 19, Exchange st, Bolton
 HUDSON, WILLIAM, Whitfield, Falsfield, Glo, Farmer Mar 16 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 JENKINS, WILLIAM, Llandilofawr, Carmarthen, Tea Merchant Mar 19 at 12.30 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
 JENNISON, FRANCIS HERBERT, Upper Cheyney, nr Bittou, Glo, Analytical Chemist Mar 16 at 12.15 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 JONES, THOMAS, Hampton in Arden, Warwick, Engineer Mar 17 at 11.30 Ruskin chmbrs, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 JOSEPH, ISAAC, New Cut, Lambeth, Fruiterer Mar 16 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 KAY, WILLIE, Southdown, Halifax, Farm Bailiff Mar 16 at 2.45 County Court, Prescott st, Halifax
 LEATHES, GABRIEL DE MUSENEDER, Herringfleet, Suffolk Mar 17 at 11.45 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 McCLELLAND, SAMUEL, Aldersgate st, Shipping Agent Mar 16 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MAGGS, THOMAS WILLIAM, Bristol, Fruiterer Mar 16 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 MASON, WILLIAM CHARLES, Portland pl, Clapham rd, Tin Plate Worker Mar 16 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MASSEY, C W, & Co, Clacton on Sea, Wine Merchants Mar 18 at 11 Cup Hotel, Colchester
 NORTHOVER, ERNEST JOHN, Swanage, Licensed Victualler Mar 16 at 2 100, High st, Poole
 PEGG, SAMUEL JOSEPH, Kegworth, Leicester, Baker Mar 18 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 PELL, GEORGE ARTHUR, Shrewsbury Mar 19 at 11.80 Off Rec, 22, Swan hill, Shrewsbury
 PUGH, FRED, Chilvers Coton, Nuneaton Mar 16 at 11.30 Off Rec, 8, High st, Coventry
 PYE, RICHARD, Hadley, nr Wellington, Milkseller April 5 at 10.30 Off Rec, 22, Swan hill, Shrewsbury
 READ, JOHN, Silsden, Yorks, Chipped Potato Dealer Mar 16 at 11 Off Rec, 12, Duke st, Bradford
 SANDERS, ERNEST, Sapote, Leicester, Farmer Mar 16 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 SCHWARTZ, MEILAH, Goodge st, Tottenham ct rd, Fancy Goods Dealer Mar 16 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 SEIFERT, FRITZ, Garlies rd, Forest Hill Printer Mar 16 at 12 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 SIMS, HENRY, Warmminster, Wilts, Boot Seller Mar 16 at 12 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 SINGLETON, RAUBEN, Salfrey, Birmingham Mar 18 at 12 Ruskin chmbrs, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 SNELL, HARRY ALFRED, Canterbury, Plumber Mar 16 at 10 Off Rec, 68A, Castle st, Canterbury
 STRICKLETON, MARY ALICE, Bolton, Lancs, Milliner Mar 16 at 3 19, Exchange st, Bolton
 SWEET, WILLIAM HENRY, Prittlewell, Essex, Boot Maker Mar 16 at 3 14, Bedford row, London
 TACK, GEORGE, Walpole gdns, Gunnersbury Mar 16 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 TYZACK, JOHN WILLIAM, Leeds, Jeweller Mar 16 at 2.30 Off Rec, Ruskin chmbrs, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 WATERS, ELIZABETH, Mountain Ash, Glam, Tobaccoconist Mar 18 at 2.30 Off Rec, Post Office chmbrs, Taff st, Pontypriid
 WESTWOOD, EMMA DORGAS, Walsall, General Dealer Mar 22 at 12 Off Rec, Wolverhampton
 WHYTE, WILLIAM, jun, Redruth, Cornwall, Grocer Mar 17 at 11.30 Off Rec, Princes st, Tyuro
 YOUNG, WARREN ALBERT, Walsall, Butcher Mar 18 at 12 Off Rec, Wolverhampton

ADJUDICATIONS.

BELL, GEORGE ARTHUR, Shrewsbury Shrewsbury Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 4
 BELL, WILLIAM HENRY, Devonport, Licensed Victualler Plymouth Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3

BISHOP, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Woking, Builder Guildford Pet Feb 10 Ord Mar 4
 BLAGO, WILLIAM, and GEORGE BLAGO, Retford, Notts, Plumbers Lincoln Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 BRICE, JOHN, Alexandra pk rd, Warehouseman Edmonton Pet Jan 3 Ord Mar 4
 BRINDLEY, FANNY, Hightown, Manchester, Baker Manchester Pet Feb 6 Ord Mar 5
 CARR, WILLIAM HENRY, Doncaster, Milk Dealer Sheffield Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 CARTER, WILLIAM, Colaton, Raleigh, Devon, Miller Exeter Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 CHILVERE, THOMAS EDWARD, Harleston, Norfolk, Baker Ipswich Pet Jan 25 Ord Mar 3
 COX, FREDERICK, Streatham High rd, Surrey, Schoolmaster Croydon Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 5
 EDMUNDS, EDWARD WILLIAM, Ruabon, Denbigh, Civil Engineer Wrexham Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM HENRY, Ramsgate, Iron Founder Canterbury Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 EGAN, ROBERT ASKEW, Dover Canterbury Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 ENGLAND, ROBERT WILLIAM, Great Yarmouth, Coal Merchant Great Yarmouth Pet Feb 28 Ord Mar 3
 ENTWISTLE, WILLIAM, Bolton, Yarn Agent Bolton Pet Feb 1 Ord Mar 5
 EVANS, SEBASTIAN, Cherry Barton, Molash, Kent Canterbury Pet Feb 14 Ord Mar 5
 FRANKLIN, WILLIAM, Hartow rd High Court Pet Dec 22 Ord Mar 4
 FREE, ROBERT STANLEY, Clacton on Sea Colchester Pet Feb 5 Ord Mar 5
 GRIFFITHS, FREDERICK, Tarporley, Painter Crewe Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 HAWKINS, THOMAS, Oldham, Grocer Oldham Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 HOWES, WILLIAM, Broadway, Crickwood, Draper High Court Pet Jan 19 Ord Mar 4
 HUTTON, WILLIAM THOMAS, Southgate rd, Islington, Father High Court Pet Nov 19 Ord Mar 4
 KAT, WILLIE, Southdown, Halifax, Farm Bailiff Halifax Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 McCLELLAND, SAMUEL, Aldersgate st, Shipping Agent High Court Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 5
 MCKINLAY, ROBERT GARDINER, Stevenage, Herts, Head Master Luton Pet Feb 3 Ord Mar 5
 MARTIN, THOMAS CYRIL HAGUE, Southwold, Boat Builder Great Yarmouth Pet Feb 25 Ord Mar 3
 MASON, WILLIAM CHARLES, Portland pl, Clapham rd, Tin Plate Worker High Court Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 MORRELL, JOSEPH THOMAS, Southend on Sea, Clerk Chelmsford Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 4
 NORTHOVER, ERNEST JOHN, Swanage, Dorset, Licensed Victualler Poole Pet Mar 4 Ord Mar 4
 OXLEY, JAMES, Denton, Barham, Kent, Glazier Canterbury Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 PEATE, WILLIAM MIDDLETON, Yeasdon, Yorks Leeds Pet Feb 7 Ord Mar 4
 POTTS, JAMES, Halthwaite, Northumberland, Motor Engineer Carlisle Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 5
 PYE, RICHARD, Hadley, nr Wellington, Salop, Milkseller Shrewsbury Pet Mar 3 Ord Feb 3
 READ, JOHN, Marsh, Silsden, Yorks, Chipped Potato Dealer Bradford Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 REDMAN, THOMAS, Cardiff, Horse Dealer Cardiff Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 ROBERTS, EDWARD, Southport, Coach Builder Liverpool Pet Mar 5 Ord Mar 5
 ROBERTS, JOHN STEPHEN, Blaenau Ffestiniog, Merioneth, Quarryman Portmadoc Pet Mar 2 Ord Mar 2
 SEED, WILLIAM, Dutton, nr Longridge, Lancs, Farmer Preston Pet Feb 11 Ord Mar 3
 STEVENSON, WILLIAM THOMAS, Plymouth, Builder Plymouth Pet Feb 19 Ord Mar 4
 STRICKLETON, MARY ALICE, Bolton, Milliner Bolton Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 TYZACK, JOHN WILLIAM, Leeds, Jeweller Leeds Pet Mar 3 Ord Mar 3
 WATERS, ELIZABETH, Mountain Ash, Glam, Tobaccoconist Aberdare Pet Mar 1 Ord Mar 1
 WILKINSON, ARABELLA THYZER, Folkestone, Lodging House Keeper Canterbury Pet Feb 24 Ord Mar 5

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Feb 18.

BARLOW, ROBERT HENRY, West Bromwich, Staffs West Bromwich Pet Feb 15 Ord Feb 15

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ESTABLISHED IN 1890.

EXCLUSIVE BUSINESS—LICENSED PROPERTY.

X

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Upwards of 650 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation.

X

Suitable Insurance Clauses for inserting in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

IO.

uildford
Notta,
monton
Man-
Sheffield
Exeter
Baker
lmaster
e, Civil
Founder
Mar 5
al Mer-
r 3
on Pet
Canter-
Pet Dec
lchester
we Pet
et Mar 3
r High
lington,
Balliff
g Agent
s, Head
Builder
rd, Tin
Mar 4
e, Clerk
icensed
Canter-
ds Pet
Motor
ilkseller
Potato
ff Pet
verpool
rioneth,
2
Farmer
er Ply-
on Pet
Pet Mar
aconist
Lodging
Mar 5
in the
ts West

TEE

X

ee sent

21

ord
ta,
son
in-
ld
er
er
er
il
er
5

A

15

Be

SV

T

V
o

L

R